

SUPPLEMENTS TO
VIGILIAE CHRISTIANAE



Community Building in the *Shepherd of Hermas*

A Critical Study of Some Key Aspects



MARK GRUNDEKEN

BRILL

Community Building in the *Shepherd of Hermas*

Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae

TEXTS AND STUDIES OF EARLY CHRISTIAN LIFE AND LANGUAGE

Editors

J. den Boeft
B.D. Ehrman
K. Greschat
J. Lössl
J. van Oort
D.T. Runia
C. Scholten

VOLUME 131

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/vcs*

Community Building in the *Shepherd of Hermas*

A Critical Study of Some Key Aspects

By

Mark Grundeken



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Grundeken, Mark, 1984–

Community building in the Shepherd of Hermas : a critical study of some key aspects / by Mark Grundeken.
pages cm. — (Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae : texts and studies of early Christian life and language,

ISSN 0920-623X ; volume 131)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-90-04-29885-9 (hardback : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-90-04-29963-4 (e-book)

1. Hermas, active 2nd century. Shepherd. 2. Communities—Religious aspects—Christianity. 1. Title.

BS2900.H5G78 2015

229'.93—dc23

2015015946

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual 'Brill' typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities.
For more information, please see brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0920-623X

ISBN 978-90-04-29885-9 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-29963-4 (e-book)

Copyright 2015 by Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill nv incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi and Hotei Publishing.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill nv provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Contents

Preface VII

Introduction 1

- 1 Research Problem 1
- 2 Research Question and Methodology 22
- 3 The Present Study 22

1 Jewish Christianity 24

- 1 Continuity 26
- 2 Differentiation 34
- Concluding Remarks 51

2 Resurrection Belief 53

- 1 Resurrection, Angelic Afterlife, or Ascension of the Soul to Heaven? 56
- 2 A Continued Existence 63
- Concluding Remarks 68

3 Sectarianism 69

- 1 Difference: Unconventional Views on the Conventional Family 70
- 2 Antagonism: *Hermas*' Horizon 72
- 3 Separation: Group Boundaries 76
- 4 Type of Sectarianism 82
- Concluding Remarks 84

4 The Roman Empire 85

- 1 *Hermas* and the Authorities 86
- 2 *Hermas* and the Emperor Cult 94
- Concluding Remarks 97

5 Women 98

- 1 Sexuality 98
- 2 Female Visibility 104
- 3 Gender Roles 105
- Concluding Remarks 112

6 "Charity" 114

- 1 Charity as Pious Duty in the Self-Interest of the Giver 115
- Concluding Remarks 127

7	Baptism and <i>Metanoia</i>	128
1	Baptism	129
2	<i>Metanoia</i>	133
	Concluding Remarks	140
8	Community Meals	141
1	<i>Vision</i> 3,9	141
2	<i>Similitude</i> 9,11	147
3	The Lord's Supper as a Real (Filling) Meal	148
	Concluding Remarks	150
9	The Sunday Collection	152
1	Frequency, Day and Occasion	152
2	Personal Help	154
3	Give and Take	157
	Concluding Remarks	159
10	Dancing (and Singing)	160
1	Dancing in a Christian Gathering	161
2	Parallels	163
3	Meaning	168
	Concluding Remarks	170
11	The "Holy Kiss"	171
1	A Welcoming Kiss of Honour	171
2	A Kiss with Ritual Connotations	174
	Concluding Remarks	179

General Conclusions 180

Bibliography 183

Index of Ancient Sources 210

Index of Modern Authors 229

Preface

This monograph is a revised and shortened version of my dissertation that was defended and accepted at the KU Leuven on 17 May 2013. Special thanks are due to my supervisor, Professor Joseph Verheyden (Leuven), and to the correctors, emeritus Professor Henk Jan de Jonge (Leiden), Dr Paul Foster (Edinburgh) and emeritus Professor Gilbert Van Belle (Leuven), for their helpful comments on an earlier version of my thesis. The financial support of the Research Foundation—Flanders (FWO), Brussels, is gratefully acknowledged. I also owe my gratitude to Brill and to the editors of *Vigiliae Christianae, Supplements* for accepting my work into their series.

I am thankful to the following professors who over the years have proven to be excellent mentors (in chronological order): Henk Jan de Jonge and Jürgen Zangenberg (Leiden), Christopher Tuckett (Oxford), Joseph Verheyden (Leuven), Cilliers Breytenbach (Berlin) and Ferdinand Prostmeier (Freiburg).

I dedicate this book to my family. *Voor wie ik liefheb, wil ik heten* (N.M. Min, 1966).

Mark Grundeken

Freiburg, 5 May 2015

Introduction

“Listen . . . and understand, you stupid!” This is how the figure of the Shepherd rebukes the figure Hermas in the *Shepherd of Hermas* (further: *Hermas*).¹ The example illustrates that in *Hermas* rhetoric plays an important role. The present study investigates the image of “community” which the author Hermas constructs as part of his rhetorical strategy.² For Hermas, the community consists of four “circles”: the house church (e.g., *Vis.* 1,1,9), the church (ἐκκλησία) in Rome (*Vis.* 2,4,3), the communities in other cities (*Vis.* 2,4,3) and the church as a whole (ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ, *Sim.* 9,18,2).³ In all three parts of the work, the *Visions*, the *Mandates* and the *Similitudes*, the Christian audience is regularly addressed in the second person plural.⁴ It is hard to determine which of the four “circles” Hermas addresses. This will, therefore, be left out of consideration. “Hermas’ community” will be used in the sense of the body of Christian believers which the author addresses.⁵

1 Research Problem

Hermas has been used in a rather naive way as a historical source for the real-life situation of the church in Rome around the beginning of the second

-
- 1 See *Sim.* 9,12,1. See also *Vis.* 3,6,5; 3,8,9 (woman church); 3,10,9 (young man); *Man.* 10,1,2; 12,4,2; and *Sim.* 9,14,4 (Shepherd).
 - 2 For a similar approach to early Christian writings of the first and second century other than *Hermas*, see J. DELOBEL – H.J. DE JONGE – M. MENKEN – H. VAN DE SANDT (eds.), *Vroegchristelijke gemeenten tussen werkelijkheid en ideaal. Opstellen van leden van de Studiosorum Novi Testamenti Conventus*, Kampen, Kok, 2001.
 - 3 The way in which Hermas’ “house” (οἶκος) and “the house of God” (ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ) are presented, indicates that the *house church* and the *church as a whole* are meant. For Hermas’ “house” (οἶκος) in relation to “all” (believers), see esp. *Vis.* 1,1,9; *Man.* 5,1,7; *Sim.* 5,3,9; and 7,7. For ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ, *Sim.* 9,13,9 and 9,14,1.
 - 4 Hermas does not seem to address non-believers. See also M. LEUTZSCH, *Hirt des Hermas*, part two of U.H.J. KÖRTNER – M. LEUTZSCH (eds.), *Papiasfragmente. Hirt des Hermas* (SUC, 3), Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998, pp. 105–497, p. 367 n. 86: “Nichtchristliche Adressaten sind jedenfalls an keiner Stelle ausdrücklich im Blick”. For the address in the second person plural, see, e.g., *Vis.* 3,9,1; *Man.* 12,6,1; *Sim.* 1,1; and 9,33,1. For the address ἀδελφοί, *Vis.* 2,4,1; 3,1,1,4; 3,10,3; and 4,1,1,5,8.
 - 5 LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 129 (with p. 367 nn. 92–93), notes that Hermas’ addressees include “die Gesamtgemeinde” (*passim*) as well as “die Gesamtheit der Christen” (*Vis.* 2,4,3).

century.⁶ This position is disputable for at least two reasons. First, it cannot be taken for granted that the community, as constructed by the author, reflects the historical situation. As the rhetoric makes clear, Hermas aims at changing the community for the better. Second, a reconstruction of the historical context in which the work was written is problematic for external as well as internal reasons. This second point will now be elaborated.

1.1 External Problems

1.1.1 Date

A first problem is that it is difficult to establish when *Hermas* was written. Estimates of the date of composition vary from the second half of the first to the second half of the second century.⁷ There are three main external

6 See, e.g., W. VON CHRIST – W. SCHMID – O. STÄHLIN, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur*. II. *Die nachklassische Periode der griechischen Litteratur*. II. *Von 100 bis 530 nach Christus* (HAW, 7), München, Beck, 1924⁶, p. 1222: “die Schrift [wird] zu einer wichtigen Quelle für die in der römischen Gemeinde jener Zeit herrschenden Anschauungen und Zustände”; L.W. BARNARD, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1966, p. 163: “He [Hermas] is in close contact with the Christian life as it was being lived by ordinary Church members in the Church of Rome and gives us a valuable insight into what people were thinking and the way they were behaving”; J.S. JEFFERS, *Conflict at Rome: Social Order and Hierarchy in Early Christianity*, Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 1991, *passim*, who takes 1 Clement and *Hermas* as two more or less contemporary (but socially different) reflections of the Roman church; C. OSIEK, *The Oral World of Early Christianity in Rome: The Case of Hermas*, in K.P. DONFRIED – P. RICHARDSON (eds.), *Judaism and Christianity in First-Century Rome*, Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, Eerdmans, 1998, pp. 151–172, p. 171: “The *Shepherd* reveals to us something of the thought world of the nonelites of early imperial Rome . . . It reveals, too, something of the piety of the ordinary early Christians of Rome, who were probably much like the author”; and EAD., *Shepherd of Hermas: A Commentary* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 1999, p. 38: “*Hermas* becomes a window on the world of everyday Christianity” (cf. p. 24: “there is a basis of historicity upon which the author builds to emphasize his message”). Cf. N. BROX, *Der Hirt des Hermas* (KAV, 7), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991, p. 23: “Hält man H[ermas] also für einen römischen Christen, so hat man damit doch nicht die gesamte Kirche der Stadt mit dem P[astor]H[ermae] identifiziert. Mit seiner eigenwilligen Version und Engführung des Christentums ist er wohl nur für eine oder allenfalls für einen Teil von mehreren Gemeinden Roms typisch, repräsentativ, aktuell und erträglich”.

7 See, e.g., H. KOESTER, *Einführung in das Neue Testament im Rahmen der Religionsgeschichte und Kulturgeschichte der hellenistischen und römischen Zeit*, Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 1980, p. 694 (between 60 and 160); and LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 136 (between 70 and 150). For a more recent discussion of the dating problem, see A. GREGORY, *Disturbing Trajectories: 1 Clement, the Shepherd of Hermas and the Development of Early Roman Christianity*, in P. OAKES (ed.), *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church*, Carlisle, Paternoster, 2002, pp. 142–166, pp. 151–153.

arguments.⁸ First, Hermas would be the Hermas of Rom 16,14, who is to be situated around the middle of the first century. Second, the Clement in *Vis.* 2,4,3 would be Clement of Rome, who is usually situated at the end of the first century. Third, there is the reference in the *Canon Muratori*: “Hermas wrote the *Shepherd* recently in our times in the city of Rome, when bishop Pius, his brother, was seated in the chair of the church of the city of Rome”.⁹ According to Eusebius, Pius’ episcopate was around the middle of the second century.¹⁰

All three arguments are unconvincing. “Hermas” was a common name, so there is no need to explain it from any source.¹¹ There is no reason to assume that the name is a pseudonym, because it is only mentioned in passing; it is not emphasized by stating, for instance, at the beginning of the work, “Hermas, to the Christians of Rome”, or something similar.¹² Origen’s account, in which the

8 Other external arguments relate to the manuscript evidence. P. PARSONS, *Letter to B.M. Metzger* (28 October 1985), partly quoted in B. METZGER, *The Canon of the New Testament*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1987, p. 63 n. 36, suggests that *Papyrus Iandanae* 1,4 (*Herm. Man.* 11,19–24; 12,1,2–3) dates back to the early second century. This early dating is, however, disputable. See A. CARLINI, *Testimone e testo: Il problema della datazione di Pland I 4 del Pastore di Erma*, in *SCO* 42 (1992) 17–30, who stresses the problems with dating such manuscripts; and LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 118: “P. Iandanae . . . stammt aus dem dritten oder vierten Jahrhundert”. Other manuscript evidence is the oldest extant Latin translation of *Hermas*, the so-called *Vulgate* (L¹), which has been dated to around 200. See C. TORNAU – P. CECCONI (eds.), *The Shepherd of Hermas in Latin: Critical Edition of the Oldest Translation Vulgata* (TU, 173), Berlin, de Gruyter, 2014, p. 10. Finally, F.J.A. HORT, *Hermas and Theodotion* (originally published in *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* IV nr. 35 [1884]), quoted in J.R. HARRIS, *Hermas in Arcadia and Other Essays*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1896, pp. 23–24, argues that agreements between *Herm. Vis.* 4,2,4 and Dan 6,23 Θ indicate that “Hermas cannot be older than Theodotion” (p. 24). Cf. J.R. HARRIS, *On the Angelology of Hermas* (originally published in *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* III nr. 30 [1884]), in ID., *Hermas in Arcadia*, pp. 21–25, p. 25: “we might hold the posteriority of Hermas to be *non-proven*” (italics his). Even if *Hermas* is dependent on Theodotion (which is questionable), it still stands that the dating of Theodotion is uncertain (see BROX, *Hirt*, p. 25).

9 *Muratorian Fragment*, ll. 73–77 (ed. HAHNEMAN, with adaptations): *Pastorem vero nuperime temporibus nostris in urbe Roma Hermas conscripsit sedente cathedra urbis Romae ecclesiae Pio episcopo fratre eius*.

10 Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4,11,6 (ed. BARDY).

11 OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 44 (with refs. in n. 21): “the author’s fairly common and frequently servile Greek name”.

12 Cf. J.B. LIGHTFOOT, *The Apostolic Fathers. I. S. Clement of Rome*, London, Macmillan, 1890², p. 360: “the possibility still remains that *Hermas* is a *nom de plume* assumed by the brother of Pius for the purposes of dramatic fiction, and that the epoch of this fiction is placed by him half a century or so before he wrote . . . In this case he may have had in his

connection between Hermas and Rom 16,14 is found for the first time, is rather suspicious.¹³ Origen considers *Hermas* as divinely inspired and therefore probably wants to link it with the apostolic past.¹⁴ The idea that Hermas is to be identified as the Hermas in Romans is unfounded.

The same counts for the idea that the Clement in *Vis.* 2,4,3 would be Clement of Rome (the author of *1 Clement* and/or the bishop).¹⁵ “Clement” was a fairly common name.¹⁶ Even if the author of *1 Clement* is meant, which is speculative, the connection would not establish the date of *Hermas*, because it is uncertain when *1 Clement* was written.¹⁷ Furthermore, the information that Clement was bishop of Rome at the end of the first century (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3,15) cannot be taken for granted. Finally, Clement’s task in *Vis.* 2,4,3 is not described as

mind the Hermas mentioned by S. Paul among the Roman Corinthians. On the whole however it seems probable that . . . the fiction of the Shepherd is founded on the actual circumstances of the writer’s own life”. For the idea that “Hermas” is not a pseudonym, but the real name of the author, see, e.g., BROX, *Hirt*, p. 43; and H.O. MAIER, *The Social Setting of the Ministry as Reflected in the Writings of Hermas, Clement and Ignatius* (Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion Dissertation Series, 1), Waterloo, ON, Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1991, p. 55: “If the writer had been attempting to ground his composition in the apostolic past, one would have expected him to make far greater and clearer claims to the period he sought to evoke”.

- 13 Origen, *Comm. Rom.* 10,31 (ed. HAMMOND Bammel – Frede – Stanjek, with adaptations): *Puto autem quod Hermas* [i.e., the Hermas of Rom 16,14] *iste sit scriptor libelli illius qui Pastor appellatur, quae scriptura valde mihi utilis videtur et ut puto divinitus inspirata*. The link with the Hermas in Rom 16,14 is also found in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3,3,6 (ed. BARDY); and Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 10 (ed. HERDING), but these are not independent witnesses. See, e.g., G.M. HAHNEMAN, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon* (OTM), New York, Oxford University Press, 1992, p. 47; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 18: “Eusebius and Jerome follow him [Origen]”.
- 14 See also, e.g., LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 136: “Origenes will die Apostolizität des Texts sichern, indem er ihn einem Apostelschüler zuschreibt”; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 18.
- 15 See, e.g., VON CHRIST – SCHMID – STÄHLIN, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur*, p. 1220, who consider Clement to be bishop Clement of Rome; M. DIBELIUS, *Der Hirt des Hermas* (HNT Erg. Die Apostolischen Väter, 4), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1923, p. 422, who takes Clement as “den berühmten römischen Clemens” (though, regards the reference as literary fiction); J.M. RIFE, *Hermas and the Shepherd*, in *ClW* 37 (1943) 81: “Clement must have been the Bishop”; HAHNEMAN, *Muratorian Fragment*, p. 38: “The Clement here is most probably Clement of Rome (c. 92–101)”; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 17: “Clement is an important figure in the Roman church, probably to be identified with the man known to history as Clement of Rome”.
- 16 See BROX, *Hirt*, p. 108.
- 17 See LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, pp. 136–137.

that of a bishop; the idea that *Hermas* would be a witness to the development towards a monarchical episcopacy is groundless.¹⁸

The reference in the *Canon Muratori* is problematic as well. Its statement that the *Pastor* was written “recently” (*nuperrime*) by the brother of Pius may well be meant to downplay the authority of *Hermas* on the basis of a lack of ancientness. The *Canon* states that the *Shepherd* “should indeed be read”, but “cannot be read publicly to the people in the church”.¹⁹ Apparently, the composer of the *Canon* did not want *Hermas* to be read publicly (that is, most likely, in the assembly) and therefore probably states that it was written only “recently”.²⁰ It has been argued that the *Canon*’s reference to *Hermas* is meant to make the *Fragment* seem earlier, but this is unconvincing.²¹ Furthermore, it has been stated that, “If Eusebius had known of the Muratorian identification of the author with the brother Pius, he would have known the chronological inconsistency with Origen’s theory. The silence on Eusebius’ part strengthens the argument that the *Muratorian Canon* is in fact a much later document, perhaps contemporary with or after Eusebius”.²² This argument fails, because it is unknown what Eusebius exactly knew, whether or not he would have noticed

18 *Ibid.*, p. 136: “[Es] wird behauptet, Clemens sei der Bischof der römischen Gemeinde gewesen – eine Rückprojektion des Monepiskopats in eine Zeit, in der er noch nicht bestanden hat”. Pace P. LAMPE, *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten* (WUNT II, 18), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1989², p. 340: “eine Tendenz zur Ausbildung eines Monarchos [ist] zu erkennen”.

19 *Muratorian Fragment*, ll. 77–78 (ed. HAHNEMAN, with adaptations): *legi eum quidem oportet . . . se publicare vero in ecclesia populo neque . . . neque . . . potest*.

20 See also MAIER, *Social Setting*, p. 58: “the writer’s apologetic concern seriously impugn[s] the accuracy of the *Muratorian Canon* composer’s remark concerning the date of the *Shepherd*”. See further p. 57 (refs. to B.H. STREETER, *The Primitive Church*, London, Macmillan, 1929, p. 207; and A.C. SUNDBERG, *Canon Muratori: A Fourth Century List*, in *HTR* 66 [1973] 1–41, p. 9): “the phrase ‘in nostris temporibus’ and the term ‘nuperrime’ may refer not to the lifetime of the author of the fragment, but to the post-apostolic period”; and p. 58: “Since it appears that the fragment is in part apologetic, the placement by the author of the *Shepherd* in the reign of Pius may be a polemical effort to argue that *Hermas* falls outside the apostolic era and therefore must be noncanonical”. See also B.D. EHRMAN, *The Shepherd of Hermas*, in ID., *The Apostolic Fathers. II. Epistle of Barnabas, Papias and Quadratus, Epistle to Diognetus, The Shepherd of Hermas* (LCL, 25), Cambridge, MA – London, Harvard University Press, 2003, pp. 161–473, p. 167: “the author of the Muratorian canon was trying to distance *Hermas* from the times of the apostles, since he did not consider the book on a par with the emerging Christian Scriptures”.

21 Pace OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 18: “the *Canon*’s reference to *Hermas* may be the device of a later document to make it seem earlier”.

22 *Ibid.*, pp. 18–19.

any inconsistencies, and why Eusebius would or would not have remained silent. A real difficulty with the reference to *Hermas* in the *Fragment* is the risk of a circular argument: the *Fragment* is used for dating *Hermas* and the reference to *Hermas* for dating the *Fragment*.²³ Nevertheless, recent research has convincingly shown that the *Canon Muratori* is most likely to be situated at the end of the second or the beginning of the third century.²⁴ Consequently, *Hermas* must have been written before that time. But this does not reveal an exact date.

All three above-mentioned references are historically doubtful. Therefore, attempts to reconcile them are beside the point. It has been argued that, "The references to Clement and to Pius need not be placed in an either/or antagonism... the two references are not totally incompatible... If the person known as Clement of Rome was a young secretary in the Roman church at the end of the first century, and Hermas was a young man at the time of the first visions, it is quite possible that he and a brother named Pius could still be alive but elderly toward the middle of the second century".²⁵ There is, however, no need to reconcile unreliable references. Another idea that has been brought forward, namely that the second-century Hermas and his brother Pius were "elderly grandchildren" of the Hermas of Rom 16,14, is rather fanciful.²⁶

More reliable external evidence consists of the references to *Hermas* in Clement of Alexandria, Irenaeus (Gaul), Tertullian (Carthage) and the *Muratorian Fragment* (Rome), which indicate, because of the geographical spread, that the *terminus ante quem* lies some time before the late second century.²⁷

23 *Ibid.*, p. 18.

24 J. VERHEYDEN, *The Canon Muratori: A Matter of Dispute*, in J.-M. AUWERS – H.J. DE JONGE (eds.), *The Biblical Canons* (BETL, 163), Leuven, Peeters, 2003, pp. 487–556, p. 556, concludes that the *Canon Muratori* was composed "in the West at the end of the second or the beginning of the third century". Pace esp. HAHNEMAN, *Muratorian Fragment*, p. 215: "There is clearly a strong case for proposing that the *Fragment* is an Eastern list of New Testament works originating from the fourth century".

25 OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 19.

26 See A. CLEVELAND COXE, *Introductory Note to the Pastor of Hermas*, in A. ROBERTS – J. DONALDSON – A. CLEVELAND COXE (eds.), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to AD 325. II. Fathers of the Second Century: Hermas, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Clement of Alexandria* (American reprint of the Edinburgh edition), Edinburgh, T&T Clark; Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, 1994, pp. 3–6, p. 4: "It would not be a very bold conjecture, that Hermas and his brother were elderly grandchildren of the original Hermas, the friend of Paul".

27 For the citations from, or allusions to *Hermas* by these (and other) early Christian authors, see M. WHITTAKER, *Die Apostolischen Väter. 1. Der Hirt des Hermas* (GCS, 48),

The internal evidence for establishing the date of *Hermas* is indecisive. It has been argued that *Hermas* must have been written before Rome had a monarchical bishop, because a presbyteral form of church leadership is envisioned.²⁸ *Hermas* refers to “a group of presiding presbyters of the church (πρεσβύτεροι προϊστάμενοι τῆς ἐκκλησίας).”²⁹ The position that there was already in the first or second century a monarchical bishop in Rome is, however, based on unfounded assumptions. It has further been argued that, “*Vis.* 3:5.1, with its reference to apostles, bishops, teachers and deacons, some of whom ‘have fallen asleep’, but some of whom are still alive, suggests an earlier date than the mid-second century.”³⁰ These titles, however, do not say very much. All are found in the Pauline letters.³¹ Finally, it cannot be taken for granted that *Hermas*’ views on church leadership mirror historical developments rather than the author’s own preferred form of church governance.

-
- Berlin, Akademie, 1967², pp. xix–xx; and P. HENNE, *L'unité du Pasteur d'Hermas. Tradition et rédaction* (CRB, 31), Paris, Gabalda, 1992, pp. 15–44. For the *Canon Muratori*, see esp. VERHEYDEN, *Canon Muratori*, p. 556.
- 28 For this argument, see already O. VON GEBHARDT – A. VON HARNACK, *Hermae Pastor graece, addita versione latina recentiore e codice Palatino* (Patrum Apostolicorum Opera, 3), Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1877, p. lxxxi. See further, e.g., KOESTER, *Einführung*, p. 694; R. STAATS, *Hermas*, in *TRE* 15 (1986) 100–108, pp. 103–104; J.C. WILSON, *Toward a Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas: Its Date and Its Pneumatology*, Lewiston, NY – Queenston, ON – Lampeter, Mellen, 1993, pp. 9–61, esp. pp. 9–10.34–39.59; MAIER, *Social Setting*, p. 55: “*Hermas*... seems to assume a presbyteral organization of the community (*Vis.* 2:4.3; 3:1.8), which is consistent with an earlier date”; HAHNEMAN, *Muratorian Fragment*, p. 39: “The absence of a monarchical episcopacy in the *Shepherd* might suggest a date before the epistles of Ignatius (c. 110)”; LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 136: “Diese Spätdatierung [in the *Muratorian Fragment*] ist aber schon dadurch ausgeschlossen, daß sie den Monepiskopat voraussetzt, den *Hermas* noch nicht kennt”; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 23: “Whatever the designation, it seems that there were recognized collegial leaders in the Roman church at the time, whose title was not exactly fixed”.
- 29 OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 22. See *Vis.* 2,4,3. See also *Vis.* 2,2,6; 3,9,7; and *Sim.* 9,27,2. Osiek (*ibid.*) writes that these passages “are the only reliable statements from which to glean any information about actual church organization”.
- 30 MAIER, *Social Setting*, p. 55. HAHNEMAN, *Muratorian Fragment*, pp. 37–38, concludes on the basis of *Vis.* 3,5,1, where it is stated that “some of the apostles were still living”, and *Sim.* 9,15,4 and 9,16,5, “the apostles appear to have all died”, that “the *Shepherd* may have been written during the transition to the post-apostolic age, about the end of the first century”.
- 31 OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 22: “These titles that at some point allude to church office refer to past situations, biblical allusions, and hypothetical roles. All terms are found in the Pauline letters”. For the apostles, bishops, deacons, presbyters and teachers, see esp. *Vis.* 2,2,6; 2,4,3; 3,5,1; 3,9,7; *Sim.* 9,15,4; 9,16,5; 9,17,1; 9,25,2; 9,26,2; and 9,27,2.

Hermas has been dated after persecutions by various emperors.³² There is, however, insufficient evidence to do so. Christians were not only persecuted (or: did not only present themselves as being persecuted) in the first century, but also throughout the second century and onwards.³³ Nevertheless, it seems that *Hermas* originated some time after the reign of Nero at the earliest, because severe persecutions seem to belong to the past.³⁴ This would make the end of the first century the most likely *terminus post quem*.³⁵

It has been suggested that the work was composed around the beginning of the second century because the time of writing must have been “sufficiently removed” from the period in which the writings later collected in the New Testament originated (because *Hermas* does not refer to these writings) as well as from the period of the “great heresies” (because these are not strongly argued against).³⁶ This line of reasoning is, however, inconclusive.

-
- 32 For this argument, see already GEBHARDT – HARNACK, *Hermae Pastor*, pp. lxxvii–lxxviii. For Nero, see, e.g., OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 20 (“The memory of the local persecution under Nero in the sixties of the first century is likely”). For Domitian, T. ZAHN, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, Gotha, Perthes, 1868, pp. 133–134; and MAIER, *Social Setting*, pp. 79–80 n. 24 (who admits, though, that evidence for persecution of Christians by Domitian is weak). For Trajan, DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 422; STAATS, *Hermas*, pp. 103–104; and A. HILHORST, *Hermas*, in *RAC* 14 (1988) 682–701, pp. 682–683 (see Pliny, *Ep.* 10,96–97, ed. RADICE). Cf. HAHNEMAN, *Muratorian Fragment*, p. 41: “The persecution mentioned in the Shepherd might best be assigned . . . to Domitian . . . or the early years of Trajan”. For Hadrian or Antoninus Pius, F. CROMBIE, *The Pastor of Hermas*, in ROBERTS – DONALDSON – CLEVELAND COXE (eds.), *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. II, pp. 6–58, p. 7.
- 33 According to C.R. MOSS, *Ancient Christian Martyrdom: Diverse Practices, Theologies, and Traditions* (AYBRL), New Haven, CT – London, Yale University Press, 2012, esp. pp. 12–16, it cannot be taken for granted that Christian literature on martyrdom always reflects actual, historical persecution. For (the idea/construction of) persecution of Christians in martyrdom literature in Rome in the first two centuries, see pp. 77–99. Cf. HAHNEMAN, *Muratorian Fragment*, p. 40: “the persecution of Christians appears intermittent and sporadic from Nero to Diocletian”.
- 34 See the interpretation of *Vis.* 3,1,9 in Chapter 4.
- 35 A supporting argument for this earliest possible date could be that the first generations of believers seem to be dead (*Sim.* 9,15,4; see above). See, e.g., GEBHARDT – HARNACK, *Hermae Pastor*, p. lxxx; and LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 135. An argument used by HAHNEMAN, *Muratorian Fragment*, p. 37, is that *Hermas* was a slave of Jewish descent and that “The most probable time for a Jewish slave to have been brought to Rome was after the capture of Jerusalem in AD 70”. But the idea that *Hermas* was a “Jewish Christian”, or that he was brought to Rome, is unfounded (see Chapter 1).
- 36 See HAHNEMAN, *Muratorian Fragment*, p. 39, who notes that *Hermas* does not mention “any of the early documents to or from Rome, e.g. Romans (c. 58), Mark (c. 65), 1 Peter (c. 65)”, nor “later prominent teachers at Rome, e.g. Valentinus (c. 136), Cerdo

It has been suggested that *Hermas* was written over a long period of time, but this has been questioned by others.³⁷ *Hermas* was probably written somewhere between the end of the first and the middle of the second century. On the basis of the available evidence, an exact date cannot be established.

1.1.2 Provenance

Hermas is usually situated in or near Rome, but some have situated it elsewhere.³⁸ One of the key arguments for situating *Hermas* not in Rome but

(c. 140), Marcion (c. 140), Justin (c. 148)", and concludes that *Hermas* was most likely written "at the very beginning of the second century, sufficiently removed from the earlier writings and the later teachers". For the observation that *Hermas* does not refer to any New Testament writings or other early Christian literature, see also, e.g. A. HILHORST, *Sémitismes et latinismes dans le Pasteur d'Hermas* (GCP, 5), Nijmegen, Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1976, p. 186. For the observation concerning the teachers (in this case the "heretical" ones), see already DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 422: "die Zeit des Buches [ist] nicht ganz nahe an 150 heranzurücken... Das milde Urteil über die Gnostiker Sim. IX 22 4... zeigt, daß die Auseinandersetzung mit den großen gnostischen Häresiarchen mindestens die kirchliche Öffentlichkeit noch nicht bewegt". Cf. L. CIRILLO, *Erma e il problema dell'apocalittica a Roma*, in *CrSt* 4 (1983) 1–31, who situates *Hermas* in the age of Montanism (cf. Chapter 2). See further, e.g., STAATS, *Hermas*, pp. 103–104, who contends that *Hermas* knew no Gnostics or Montanists.

37 For the former, see, e.g., BROX, *Hirt*, p. 23: "Mit der Datierung des P[astor]H[ermae] ist der Zeitpunkt seiner End-Redaktion gemeint, dann das Buch ist aus verschiedenen Teilen komponiert, die man sich im Laufe einiger Jahrzehnte oder jedenfalls Jahre sukzessiv entstanden vorstellen muß"; OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 20: "The best assignment of date is an expanded duration of time beginning perhaps from the very last years of the first century, but stretching through most of the first half of the second century"; and EHRMAN, *Shepherd*, p. 169: "possibly over a stretch of time, during the early part of the second century, perhaps 110–40 CE". For the latter, MAIER, *Social Setting*, p. 57, who argues that it is more likely that "one author was writing over a shorter period of time"; and J. MUDDIMAN, *The Church in Ephesians, 2 Clement, and the Shepherd of Hermas*, in A.F. GREGORY – C.M. TUCKETT (eds.), *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005, pp. 107–121, p. 117: "this [i.e. Osiek's] compromise solution does not seem to do justice to the urgency that the author feels (see *Vis.* 2. 4. 3) to send his message abroad".

38 For the former, see DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 423 ("Rom"); BROX, *Hirt*, p. 22: "Alles spricht für Rom als Abfassungsort des P[astor]H[ermae]"; LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 135: "Ort der Abfassung ist Rom"; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 18: "There can be little doubt that the geographical origin of *Hermas* is central Italy and probably Rome... The book originates in Rome and its environs, but the author is familiar with some of the surrounding rural area, not only the urban setting". For the latter, esp. E. PETERSON, *Kritische Analyse der fünften Vision des Hermas*, in *HJ* 77 (1958) 362–369; rev. in ID., *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis*, Freiburg im

in a Jewish Christian environment in Palestine is that the call to μετάνοια would lack a sacramental basis: there is no connection with baptism or with the Son of God.³⁹ But if μετάνοια means inner change, it is unnecessary to assume a sacramental basis anyway. Moreover, baptism in the name of God's Son is

Breisgau, Herder, 1959, pp. 271–284, pp. 275, 282, who takes Hermas as a Jewish Christian from Palestine. But even if “Jewish Christian” is a right designation (which is put into question in Chapter 1), this does not imply that the author was from “Palestine”. It is important to note that in his later work *Giudaismo e Cristianesimo: culto giudaico e culto cristiano*, in *RSLR* 1 (1965) 367–391, p. 381, Peterson opts for a Roman origin of *Hermas*. See further H. LISCO, *Roma Peregrina. Ein Überblick über die Entwicklung des Christentums in den ersten Jahrhunderten*, Berlin, Schneider – Klinsmann, 1901, pp. 95–243, who situates *Hermas* in Ephesus. His main arguments are as follows. The title of the work would refer to the Ephesian shepherd Phrodoros (ποιμὴν εὐάγγελος) and the God Hermes (p. 95). The described architecture (like the towers in *Vis.* 3 and *Sim.* 9) and geography (like the twelve Arcadian mountains in *Sim.* 9) would be based on Ephesus and its surroundings (pp. 95–132). The towers would allude to the tower of Paul's prison in Ephesus and to the tower of the (former) Ephesian isle Syria (pp. 95–96, 119, 130). Rome (*Vis.* 1.1.1) is “Das ephesische Rom” (p. 115), “[die] römische... Vorstadt, die im zweiten Jahrhundert den Namen Rom oder Römerhafen trug” (p. 124) and “Der Tiberis könnte vielleicht ein aus mystischen Gründen gewählter Name für den Fluß Kenchrius sein” (p. 123). The women with bare (right) shoulder (*Sim.* 9.2.4) would refer to the Amazons (usually portrayed with bare [left] shoulder), founders of Ephesus (p. 96) and Cumae (*Vis.* 1.1.3, p. 116). Further, the twelve *Mandates* would correspond to the twelve first bishops: “So scheint allerdings manches dafür zu sprechen, daß die zwölf Mandate in ihrer Reihenfolge dazu bestimmt sind, anzuspielden auf die geschichtliche Folge der zwölf ersten Vorsteher der römischen Gemeinde und die Ereignisse, die sich während ihrer Regierungszeit in Ephesus zugetragen haben” (p. 145). See pp. 132–145: 1. Paul (see *Man.* 1 on πίστις), 2. Linus (λίνον, “linen” is to be smooth and pure, see *Man.* 2 on simplicity and purity), 3. Peter (see *Man.* 3 on truth, cf. Peter's denial), 4. Anacletus (“the blameless one”, see the topic of *Man.* 4), 5. Clement (“the mild one”, see *Man.* 5 on μακροθυμία), 6. Evaristus (“the pleasing one”, see terms like ἀρέσκειν, ἀρετή and ἄριστος in *Man.* 6), 7. Alexander (“the one who repulses, who instills fear”, see *Man.* 7 on φόβος), 8. Xystus (a *xystus* is a collonade of a gymnasium for winter exercise; exercise asks for restraint, see *Man.* 8 on ἐγκράτεια), 9. Telesphorus (“bringing fulfilment”, see *Man.* 9 on fulfilment of prayers), 10. Hyginus (ὕγιαίνω means “to have understanding”, see the theme of *Man.* 10), 11. Pius (*Man.* 11 refers to Gnostics during Pius' episcopate, during which *Hermas* was written) and 12. Anicetus (“undefeated”, see *Man.* 12 on fighting against and overcoming evil desire). It is not surprising that in the literature on *Hermas* Lisco's thesis has hardly even been reviewed. *Hermas* is not Hermes and not a godlike figure. The Ephesian “towers” are (unlike the ones in *Hermas*) no buildings under construction. Rome is more likely to be the Italian than the Ephesian (?) Rome. Finally, the list of bishops is anachronistic, unhistorical and does not point at Ephesus.

39 See PETERSON, *Kritische Analyse*, pp. 281–282.

evidently implied.⁴⁰ This makes the argument for an Eastern origin of *Hermas* very weak. Almost all geographical references point to Rome or central Italy.⁴¹ The one exception is the mention of Arcadia in *Sim.* 9,1,4. It has been stated that “this must be seen as mythological”,⁴² but this may be a too easy way out: *all* geographical references may be fictitious.⁴³ The use of Latin loanwords situates the text somehow in a Roman context, but not necessarily in Rome.⁴⁴ Nevertheless, the vegetation which is described is characteristic of a more northern climate; the allusions to viticulture point to a wine-growing region; and the *arbustum* in *Sim.* 2 (a vineyard where vines grow on elm trees) is typical of central Italy.⁴⁵ Finally, already the *Muratorian Fragment* and Origen assumed that *Hermas* was written in Rome. Most likely, therefore, *Hermas* was written in or near Rome.

1.1.3 Composition

The composition of the work has been one of the major issues in the literature on *Hermas*. Most scholars assume that *Hermas* was written by one author, whether or not in different stages.⁴⁶ The idea that the text

40 See esp. *Vis.* 3,7,3, on “stones” (i.e., neophytes or catechumens) wishing “to be baptized (βαπτισθῆναι) in the name of the Lord”; and *Sim.* 9,16,3, on receiving “the seal of God’s Son (τὴν σφραγίδα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ)”, to which v. 4 adds, “the seal is the water” (presumably the water of baptism).

41 See *Vis.* 1,1,1 (Rome; see also 2,4,3, “in this city”); 1,1,2 (River Tiber); 4,1,2 (*Via Campana*). See also *Vis.* 1,1,3 and 2,1,1 (Cumae, *v.l.* κώμας; see also 2,4,1, “the Sibyl”).

42 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 18.

43 See PETERSON, *Kritische Analyse*, pp. 275,282.

44 See esp. *Vis.* 3,1,4 (συνψέλιον = *subsellium*; κερβικάριον = *cervical*; λέντιον = *linteum*) and *Sim.* 5,1,1–2 (στατίων = *statio*). For the latinisms in *Hermas*, see esp. HILHORST, *Sémitismes et latinismes*.

45 Concerning the first argument, see esp. the summer and winter trees in *Sim.* 3–4 and the willow tree in *Sim.* 8. Concerning the second, e.g. *Man.* 10,1,5; *Sim.* 2; 5,2; and 9,26,4. See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 18.

46 For the position that *Hermas* is the work of a single author, see, e.g., GEBHARDT–HARNACK, *Hermas Pastor*, pp. lxxii–lxxiii; A. LINK, *Die Einheit des Pastor Hermas*, Marburg, Elwert, 1888; P. BAUMGÄRTNER, *Die Einheit des Hermas-Buchs*, Freiburg im Breisgau, Mohr Siebeck, 1889; F.X. FUNK, *Die Einheit des Hirten des Hermas*, in *ThQ* 81 (1899) 321–360; repr. in ID., *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen*. III, Paderborn, Schöningh, 1907, pp. 230–261; C. TAYLOR, *The Shepherd of Hermas*. I, London, SPCK, 1903, p. 22 (“a work originally composed in two books by one and the same imaginative writer and teacher”); DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 420–421 (perhaps one author, but certainly various stages: *Vis.* 1–4; *Vis.* 5 to *Sim.* 8; addition of *Sim.* 9 [plus some changes to *Vis.* 5 and addition of the epilogue to *Man.* 12], so that *Vis.* 1–4 and *Vis.* 5 to *Sim.* 8 were connected; *Sim.* 10);

was composed by more than one author has always remained a minority position.⁴⁷

R. JOLY, *Hermas. Le Pasteur* (SC, 53), Paris, Cerf, 1958, pp. 15–16; HILHORST, *Hermas*, in *RAC* 14 (1988) 682–701, p. 682; STAATS, *Hermas*, pp. 101–102; BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 25–33, esp. p. 28 (different stages: *Vis.* 1–4; *Vis.* 5–*Sim.* 8; *Sim.* 9–10); HENNE, *L'unité*; ID., *Un seul 'Pasteur', un seul Hermas*, in *RTL* 23 (1992) 482–488; WILSON, *Reassessment*, pp. 22–23; OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 10 (with) n. 90 (“I now think single authorship in several stages and redactions best fits the evidence”; cf. her earlier *Rich and Poor in the Shepherd of Hermas: An Exegetical-Social Investigation* [CBQMS, 15], Washington, DC, Catholic Biblical Association, 1983, p. 7, where she took Giet’s position as point of departure); and D. HELLHOLM, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, in W. PRATSCHER (ed.), *Die Apostolischen Väter. Eine Einleitung* (UTB, 3272), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009, pp. 226–253, pp. 228.230.249–250; followed by V. BLOMKVIST, *The Teaching on Baptism in the Shepherd of Hermas*, in D. HELLHOLM – T. VEGGE – Ø. NORDERVAL – C. HELLHOLM (eds.), *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism. Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity / Waschungen, Initiation und Taufe. Spätantike, Frühes Judentum und Frühes Christentum*. II (BZNW, 176), Berlin, de Gruyter, 2011, pp. 849–870, pp. 850–853 (one author; three stages: 1. *Vis.* 1–4, published in the first quarter of the second century; 2. *Man.* 1–*Sim.* 8; 3. *Sim.* 9–10 and *Vis.* 5, published [with the rest] in the middle or at the end of the second quarter of the second century).

- 47 For two authors, see, e.g., H.W. THIERSCH, *Die Kirche im apostolischen Zeitalter*, Frankfurt am Main, Herder – Zimmer, 1852, pp. 350–358 (the *Visions* were composed by the Hermas of Rom 16,14 and the rest by another author around the middle of the second century); F. DE CHAMPAGNY, *Les Antonins—ans de J.-C., 69–180—*. I, Paris, Bray, 1866, p. 144 (the Hermas of Rom 16,14 composed the *Visions* and the brother of Pius the rest: “Je n’hésite donc pas à penser que la première partie (*Visiones*) . . . est l’œuvre du premier Hermas, contemporain de saint Paul; que les deux autres, au contraire (*Mandata et Similitudines*), sont l’œuvre du second Hermas, surnommé Pasteur, frère du pape Pie 1^{er}”); J. HAUSLEITER, *De versionibus Pastoris Hermæ latinis* (Acta Seminarii Philologici Erlangensis, 3), Erlangen, Jungius, 1884, pp. 399–477 (*Vis.* 5 to *Sim.* 10 were written by Hermas, the brother of Pius; *Vis.* 1–4 were added at the end of the second century and attributed to the Hermas of Rom 16,14); F. SPITTA, *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums*. II. *Der Brief des Jakobus. Studien zum Hirten des Hermas*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896, pp. 241–437 (*Hermas* was written around the middle of the first century by a Jew; in the middle of the second century a Christian, probably the brother of Pius, Christianized it); H.A. VAN BAKEL, *De compositie van den Pastor Hermæ*, Amsterdam, De Roever Kröber & Bakels, 1900 (*Hermas* was at the end of the first century written by a Jew in several stages; around the middle of the second century it was Christianized by several additions and interpolations); D. VÖLTER, *Die apostolischen Väter neu untersucht*. I. *Clemens, Hermas, Barnabas*, Leiden, Brill, 1904, pp. 171–327, p. 175 (*Vis.* 1 to *Sim.* 8 originated in a community of proselytes; Christian additions and a Christian redaction followed); L.W. BARNARD, *The Shepherd of Hermas in Recent Study*, in *HeyJ* 9 (1968) 29–36, p. 32 (*Vis.* 1–4 around the end of the second century; *Vis.* 5 to *Sim.* 10 around 135); L. CIRILLO, *Conférences sur les idées et le vocabulaire juifs du Pasteur d’Hermas*, in *AEPHE.R* 80–81 (1971–1973) 336–337, p. 336

Behind many theories of multiple authorship lies the desire to reconcile the references to Hermas (Rom 16,14), Clement (*Vis.* 2,4,3) and Pius (*Muratorian Fragment*). If all three references would be historical, Hermas must have lived for about a century, which is unlikely.⁴⁸ But, as already seen, these historically doubtful references do not need to be reconciled.

("à l'origine une source juive remaniée par un auteur chrétien"); MAIER, *Social Setting*, p. 58 (a single author, but perhaps another final redactor); and M.W. HOLMES (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, Grand Rapids, MI, Baker Academic, 2007³, pp. 445–446 (*Vis.* 1–4 and *Vis.* 5–*Sim.* 10 were written separately).

For three authors, see, e.g., A. HILGENFELD, *Hermas Pastor graece*, Leipzig, Weigl, 1866, pp. xxi–xxix (before the year 112, *Vis.* 5, the *Mandates* and *Sim.* 1–7 were written by *Hermas pastoralis*, a Roman Jewish Christian; not earlier than 113, *Vis.* 1–4 by *Hermas apocalypticus*, again a Jewish Christian in Rome; and around 140, *Sim.* 8–10 by *Hermas secundarius*); S. GIET, *Hermas et les pasteurs. Les trois auteurs du Pasteur d'Hermas*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1963; ID., *Les trois auteurs du Pasteur d'Hermas*, in *StPatr* 8 = TU 93 (1966) 10–23 (between 100–140, *Vis.* 1–4 were written by a contemporary of Clement of Rome; in the middle of the second century, *Sim.* 9 was composed [on the basis of *Vis.* 1–4] by the brother of Pius; finally, several years later, *Vis.* 5 to *Sim.* 8 and *Sim.* 10 were written by a Jewish Christian); P. NAUTIN, *Erma (Pastore)*, in *DPAC* 1 (1983) 1197–1198, p. 1197 (one Hermas wrote *Vis.* 1–4; an anonymous author the rest; and a third put the two parts together); OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, pp. 6–7 (following Giet; but cf. her later *Shepherd*); and L.W. NIJENDIJK, *Die Christologie des Hirten des Hermas exegetisch, religions- und dogmengeschichtlich untersucht* (PhD thesis, University of Utrecht, 1986), pp. 74.175–180 (two authors and one editor).

For more than three authors, see esp. W. COLEBORNE, *A Linguistic Approach to the Problem of Structure and Composition of the Shepherd of Hermas* (PhD thesis, University of Newcastle, 1965); ID., *A Linguistic Approach to the Problem of Structure and Composition of the Shepherd of Hermas*, in *Coll(A)* 3 (1969) 133–142; and ID., *The Shepherd of Hermas: A Case for Multiple Authorship and Some Implications*, in *StPatr* 10 = TU 107 (1970) 65–70, who concludes that *Hermas* (except *Sim.* 10, which was not analysed because there are no Greek manuscripts) had six authors or redactors (1. *Man.* 1–12,3,3, in the sixties of the first century; 2. *Sim.* 1–7, in the same period; 3. *Vis.* 5 and the rest of *Man.* 12 [editorial additions, which combined the parts]; 4. *Vis.* 1–4, in the nineties; 5. *Sim.* 8, at the end of the first century [as addition to *Vis.* 1–*Sim.* 7]; 6. *Sim.* 9, between 98 and 117); and PETERSON, *Kritische Analyse*, pp. 283–284, who assumes collective authorship by a "school".

- 48 By mistake, A.Y. COLLINS, *Mark: A Commentary* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 2007, gives the impression that Hermas is still alive! In the Index of Modern Authors one of the references to T. Shepherd (who is currently Professor at Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, USA) is actually to the *Shepherd of Hermas*. See p. 890, "Shepherd, T. . . .536¹²⁴"; and p. 536 n. 124, "*Shepherd of Hermas*". In a private conversation, Professor Shepherd told me that he is honoured to be credited with the work and we can assure the reader that he looks incredibly good for his age!

It should be noted that *Vis.* 1–4 on the one hand and *Vis.* 5 to *Sim.* 10 on the other form a literary unity because the woman church appears only in the former and the Shepherd only in the latter. Furthermore, there are some awkward transitions from a concluded section to a new one.⁴⁹ Finally, there are several literary and stylistic aspects: the work is relatively long, there are various sorts of repetitions and inconsistencies and the passages are connected in an associative and additive way on the basis of a variety of themes. All this, however, does not necessarily imply multiple authorship;⁵⁰ it merely indicates that the author, just like many other early Christian authors, was not a very skilled writer.⁵¹ A theory of multiple authorship creates more problems than it solves:⁵² it is easier to explain the above-mentioned characteristics from one author's shortcomings than to clarify how more than one author created the whole.⁵³

Another issue is whether the text was originally published as a whole, or that the present text was composed of various parts which first circulated independently. As a matter of fact, *Hermas* is a composite text, consisting of three parts (five *Visions*, twelve *Mandates* and ten *Similitudes*). It should be noted that *Vis.* 1–4 do not refer to the *Mandates* or *Similitudes*, whereas *Vis.* 5,5 and *Sim.* 9,1 presuppose all three parts which have come down to us.⁵⁴

It has been argued that *Papyrus Bodmer* (Bo) contained only *Vis.* 1–4, whereas *Papyrus Michigan* (M) as well as the two Coptic translations (C^a and C^s) included only *Vis.* 5 to *Sim.* 10.⁵⁵ These arguments regarding the papyri are

49 See, e.g., *Sim.* 9,1,1; 9,33; and 10,1.

50 See also LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, pp. 130–132; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 3–4,8–10.

51 See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 33: "Die Irritationen im Text resultieren also aus Schwächen des Schriftstellers H[ermas]... der seines Stoffs und seiner Absichten nicht immer Herr geworden ist". Cf. M. WHITTAKER, *Hermas, Shepherd of*, in *NCE* 6 (1967) 1074–1075, who notes that inconsistencies are characteristic of apocalyptic literature; BARNARD, *Shepherd*, p. 32: "[*Hermas*] is a rambling prophetic work which cannot easily be systematized. It may be that we should not expect to find a coherent theology running through it"; and OSIEK, *Oral World*, p. 171: "The author's goal... is not theological consistency but a variety of images".

52 See also HILHORST, *Sémitismes*, p. 186: "Cette solution [i.e., assuming multiple authorship] soulève plus de questions qu'elle n'en résout"; and BROX, *Hirt*, p. 31: "Das Verfahren [i.e., assuming multiple authorship] provoziert mehr Fragen, als es beantwortet".

53 BROX, *Hirt*, p. 33.

54 See the meta-textual analysis by D. HELLHOLM, *Das Visionenbuch des Hermas als Apokalypse. Formgeschichtliche und texttheoretische Studien zu einer literarischen Gattung. I. Methodologische Vorüberlegungen und makrostrukturelle Textanalyse* (CB.NT, 13), Lund, Gleerup, 1980, pp. 11–13.

55 See, resp., A. CARLINI, *Papyrus Bodmer XXXVIII. Erma: Il Pastore (1a–IIIIa visione)* (BBod), Cologne—Genève, Fondation Martin Bodmer, 1991, p. 12; C. BONNER, *A Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas (Similitudes 2–9) with a Fragment of the Mandates* (UMS.H, 22),

primarily based on the pagination of the manuscripts. It is possible, however, that the page numbers were added when some pages were already lost.⁵⁶

It has been pointed out that *Vis.* 5 is in some manuscripts marked as the beginning of a new section. *Codex Sinaiticus* (S) heads it with ἀποκάλυψις ε΄ (instead of θρασὺς ε΄, as in the *Codex Athous* [A], the *Vulgate* [L¹] and the Ethiopic version [E]); some manuscripts containing L¹ with (*visio quinta*) *initium pastoris*...; and the *Palatine* (L²) with *incipiunt pastoris mandata duodecim*.⁵⁷ Even if the reading of S is more original than the others, which is probably true because it is the *lectio difficilior*, it does not follow, however, that the heading marks the beginning of a new section: it marks the “revelation” as the “fifth”, which makes clear that there were four earlier sections. Moreover, the readings *initium pastoris* (L¹) and *incipiunt pastoris mandata duodecim* (L²) show only that the Latin translators highlight the entrance of the figure of the Shepherd into the story. Besides, all headings may be secondary.

It has been contended that Athanasius takes the first *Mandate* as the beginning of *Hermas*.⁵⁸ Athanasius does not seem to mean, however, that *Man.* 1 is the beginning of *Hermas*, but of the work’s teaching section.⁵⁹

Finally, the fact that the *Similitudes* are in some manuscripts numbered in a different way has been taken as an indication that parts of the text first circulated independently and were later combined.⁶⁰ *Man.* 12,3,4 is in A marked with “beginning” and in E with “beginning of the *Similitudes*”, the latter in combination with an alternative numbering of the rest of *Hermas*. But even if the numbering is original, which is uncertain, the length of *Hermas* in general and of the *Similitudes* in particular is sufficient to explain alternative numberings.⁶¹ Moreover, the length of the work may have been the reason why it got fragmented.⁶²

A strong argument in favour of the original unity of the work is that the earliest evidence for unity can be dated back to the late second century (namely

Ann Arbor, MI, University of Michigan Press, 1934, pp. 8–9,13; and E. LUCCHESI, *Le Pasteur d'Hermas en copte: Perspective nouvelle*, in *VigChr* 43 (1989) 393–396, esp. p. 395.

56 See LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 130: “In den meisten Fällen ist die Paginierung von späterer Hand hinzugefügt worden. Blattverlust am Anfang und Schluß der jeweiligen Manuskripte vor der Durchführung der Paginierung sind nicht auszuschließen”.

57 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 3.

58 *Ibid.*, referring to Athanasius, *Ep. fest.* 11 (339 CE).

59 HENNE, *L'unité*, pp. 38–41. Cf. LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 132: “So wird der ‘Hirt’ erst mit *man* 11 als auf die Lebenssituation und -praxis von Katechumenen bezogenes *Unterrichtsmittel* wirklich verwendbar” (italics mine).

60 For this argument, see, e.g., OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 4.

61 HENNE, *L'unité*, pp. 58–63.

62 *Ibid.*, pp. 58–59.

Tertullian in the West quoting from the *Visions* as well as from the *Mandates* and Clement of Alexandria and Origen in the East from the *Visions*, *Mandates* and *Similitudes*), whereas the earliest evidence for division is of later time (namely *Papyrus Michigan*, which probably dates from about 250 CE).⁶³

For the present study, *Hermas* has been studied as a whole on the basis of primarily, but not exclusively, the critical edition of M. Leutzsch.⁶⁴

1.2 Internal Problems

1.2.1 (Auto)biographical Information

Hermas portrays himself as a *paterfamilias* with wife and children. The few details about Hermas and his family in the text are considered by some scholars as historically reliable, by others as literary fiction, or as a combination of both.⁶⁵

63 *Ibid.*, pp. 18–21; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 4 and 8.

64 For a thorough evaluation of Leutzsch's edition, see G. LUSINI, *Nouvelles recherches sur le texte du Pasteur d'Hermas*, in *Apocrypha* 12 (2001) 79–97. For the present study, the main text-critical decisions have been made after comparing the editions of WHITTAKER, *Hirt*; LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*; and EHRMAN, *Shepherd* (and the commentaries of DIBELIUS, *Hirt*; BROX, *Hirt*; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*). Other editions, e.g., GEBHARDT – HARNACK, *Hermas Pastor*; F.X. FUNK, *Hermas Pastor*, in ID., *Patres Apostolici*. I, Tübingen, Laupp, 1901², pp. 414–639; and JOLY, *Hermas* (and the commentaries of, e.g., ZAHN, *Hirt*; and G. SNYDER, *The Shepherd of Hermas* [ApF(T), 6], Camden, NJ, Nelson, 1969) are not referred to systematically. As a matter of fact, it is best to compare those critical editions that are based on the four main Greek manuscripts: A (published in 1856), S (1863), M (1934) and Bo (1991), that is, the editions after 1991 by Leutzsch and Ehrman. All translations and paraphrases of *Hermas* in this thesis are based on Osiek's translation (*Shepherd*), with adaptations.

65 For the first position, see, e.g., R. VAN DEEMTER, *Der Hirt des Hermas: Apokalypse oder Allegorie?*, Delft, Meinema, 1929, p. 155 ("An dem historischen Charakter dieser Berichte soll man festhalten"); A. VON STRÖM, *Der Hirt des Hermas: Allegorie oder Wirklichkeit?* (AMNSU, 3), Uppsala, Wretmans, 1936, pp. 4–7 (Hermas' visionary experiences are psychologically explainable; they are "Wirklichkeitsschilderungen, nicht Allegorien"); RIFE, *Hermas*, p. 81 ("Who has ever put more autobiography into one line [*Vis.* 1.1.1]?"); and R. LANE FOX, *Pagans and Christians in the Mediterranean World from the Second Century AD to the Conversion of Constantine*, Harmondsworth, Viking, 1986, p. 381 (Hermas is "the early Christian whom we know best after St. Paul").

For the second, e.g., J. TURMEL, *Le Pasteur d'Hermas*, in *APhC* 148 (1904) 26–52, p. 28 n. 6 ("Inutile de dire que tout cela est de la fiction"); DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 419–420.445–446 (Hermas' family is not a real family, but represents the church); M.S. ENSLIN, *A Second Century Pastor*, in *CrozQ* 6 (1929) 278–298, p. 295 ("nothing but literary fiction"); B. ALTANER – A. STUIBER, *Patrologie. Leben, Schriften und Lehre der Kirchenväter*, Freiburg im Breisgau – Basel – Wien, Herder, 1980⁹, pp. 55–58, p. 55 ("Was Hermas selbst über sich und seine Familie berichtet, ist nicht autobiographisch, sondern typisch für

The third position is the most balanced one.⁶⁶ It can reasonably be assumed that there is some measure of agreement between an early Christian work, its author(s) and its addressees.⁶⁷

die sündige Gemeinde zu verstehen"); PETERSON, *Kritische Analyse*, pp. 275–277, p. 282 ("Es ist ein methodologischer Irrtum, wenn man aus dem Hirtenbuch etwas für die Geschichte des Christentums in Rom herausholen will"); and JOLY, *Hermas*, pp. 17–21 (p. 21: "fiction littéraire").

For the third, e.g., K.W. CLARK, *The Sins of Hermas*, in A. WIKGREN (ed.), *Early Christian Origins: Studies in Honor of Harold R. Willoughby*, Chicago, IL, Quadrangle, 1961, pp. 102–119, pp. 117–119; repr. in J.L. SHARPE (ed.), *The Gentile Bias and Other Essays* (NT.S., 54), Leiden, Brill, 1980, pp. 30–48 (Hermas and his family are real, but also a literary device); LAMPE, *Die stadtrömischen Christen*, pp. 182–188 (a combination of autobiographical elements and literary fiction); M. LEUTZSCH, *Die Wahrnehmung sozialer Wirklichkeit im "Hirten des Hermas"* (FRLANT, 150), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989, pp. 20–49 (a combination of fiction and non-fiction); BROX, *Hirt*, p. 42 ("Biographische Angaben und ihre exemplarische Verwendung schließen sich nicht aus. Daß in den biographischen Angaben gar nichts Historisches steckt, ist sehr unwahrscheinlich"); W.A. MEEKS, *The Origins of Christian Morality: The First Two Centuries*, New Haven, CT, Yale University Press, 1993, p. 126 (Hermas' family represents the church by synecdoche, a literary figure in which a part represents the whole, or vice versa); P. COX MILLER, *Dreams in Late Antiquity: Studies in the Imagination of a Culture*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1994, p. 142 (Hermas' family represents the church by mimetic appeal: the real world [of Hermas' addressees] is imitatively represented in a work of art or literature [Hermas' family in *Hermas*]); LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, pp. 132–133 (some parts of *Hermas* are historically plausible [e.g., the information on Hermas and his family]; other parts are literary fiction); C. OSIEK – D.L. BALCH, *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches* (The Family, Religion, and Culture), Louisville, KY, Westminster John Knox, 1997, p. 273 n. 55 (a real family in a situation that echoes that of the Christian community); OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 23–24 ("To pose the question so that the biographical information is either historical or not is probably to set up a false dichotomy . . . the text contains a mixture of biography and literary reworking, so that the family becomes a literary mirror of the whole community"); and EAD., *The New Testament Teaching of Family Matters*, in *HTS* 62(3) (2006) 819–843, p. 835 n. 22 (whether the information about Hermas' family is historical or not, "the story of the family is typical of its family's social location").

66 See further, e.g., BROX, *Hirt*, p. 42: "nicht alles an personellen und sachlichen Angaben, die er [Hermas] macht, [kann] fingiert sein, da er ja kontrolliert und zur Rede gestellt werden konnte". C. OSIEK, *The Genre and Function of the Shepherd of Hermas*, in A.Y. COLLINS (ed.), *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting* (Semeia, 36), Decatur, GA, Scholars Press, 1986, pp. 113–121, p. 17, argues that there is no reason to doubt the biographical details about Hermas and his family, because "they make no substantial contribution to the theological structure . . . they serve no obvious purpose".

67 See also C.M. TUCKETT, *Matthew: The Social and Historical Context—Jewish Christian and/or Gentile?*, in D. SENIOR (ed.), *The Gospel of Matthew at the Crossroads of Early*

1.2.2 Addressees

Another matter of dispute is the identity of the addressees: “ordinary” people, or more educated church members, perhaps especially “theologians”.⁶⁸ The idea that Hermas’ addressees were theologians has no basis, because the work is not known for its elaborate theological ideas.⁶⁹ There is no sufficient evidence to determine Hermas’ exact social status,⁷⁰ but the level of the Greek, the contents and the structure of the text indicate that the author is to

Christianity (BETL, 243), Leuven, Peeters, 2011, pp. 99–129, pp. 101–102: “... although one should be wary of making too neat an equation between an author and his/her community, as if the author always reflects the views of the community and never challenges them, it seems reasonable to presume a significant element of continuity between the author and the community to which s/he belonged. Hence, for some purposes, what applies to the evangelist [Matthew] may also apply to the community for which he wrote his Gospel, and vice versa”. Cf. A. LINDEMANN, *Kinder in der Welt der Antike als Thema gegenwärtiger Forschung*, in *ThR* 76 (2011) 82–111, pp. 110–111: “es [ist] nicht möglich... aus den Texten unmittelbare Schlußfolgerungen hinsichtlich der realen Gegebenheiten abzuleiten; das gilt sowohl für die ‘präskriptiven’ wie auch für die ‘deskriptiven’ Texte: Ein Verbot sagt nichts darüber, wie oft die hier verbotene Praxis tatsächlich vorkam; und die Schilderung eines bestimmten Geschehens läßt keinen Schluß zu, wie häufig das Geschilderte in der Realität vorkam... Es ist aber möglich, zumindest die Bandbreite dessen aufzuzeigen, was es—ausweislich der uns überlieferten Quellen—in der Realität jedenfalls gegeben hat. Und das zu wissen, ist schon nicht wenig”.

68 For the former, see, e.g., BROX, *Hirt*, p. 25: “Über den Adressatenkreis des P[astor] H[ermae] besteht an sich kein Zweifel, hätte ihn nicht K. Aland anders als bisher üblich definiert”. For the latter, see esp. K. ALAND, *Noch einmal: Das Problem der Anonymität und Pseudonymität in der christlichen Literatur der ersten beiden Jahrhunderte*, in E. DASSMANN – K.S. FRANK (eds.), *Pietas. Festschrift für Bernhard Kötting* (JbAC.E, 8), Münster, Aschendorf, 1980, pp. 121–139, p. 125: “Als Käufer und Leser dieser Schrift kam das normale Gemeindeglied um 150 nicht in Betracht, sondern nur die wenigen gebildeten Christen—und vor allem die Theologen”.

69 See, e.g., DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 423: “Eine Theologie besitzt Hermas nicht”.

70 As M.Y. MACDONALD, *Reading Real Women through the Undisputed Letters of Paul*, in R.S. KRAEMER – M.R. D’ANGELO (eds.), *Women & Christian Origins*, New York – Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 199–220, p. 201, states: “Social position was determined by a variety of factors: the status of one’s family, one’s finances, one’s sex, and birth into freedom or slavery all played part in determining one’s status location”. The precise status of Hermas’ family, the finances of his household, etc., remain unknown, but Hermas most likely belonged to the “humble” (*humiliores*) and within this group not to the “indigent” (*egeni*). For these terms, see T.G. PARKIN – A.J. POMEROY, *Roman Social History: A Sourcebook* (Routledge Sourcebooks for the Ancient World), London – New York, Routledge, 2007, pp. 205, 294.

be situated in the lower social classes.⁷¹ It seems that the freedman Hermas (*Vis.* 1,1,1–2) was a craftsman or businessman⁷² who belonged to the “common people” of Rome⁷³ with some wealth.⁷⁴ Finally, it is justified to assume that there was some measure of agreement between the author and his audience.⁷⁵ Yet, the philosophical background of, for instance, the catalogues of virtues and vices (esp. *Sim.* 9,15,2–3) indicates that the author aims somewhat “higher” at more educated believers as well.⁷⁶

71 See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 25: “Sprache, Inhalt, Tendenz und Form des ‘Hirten’ erwarten in ihrem vulgären Charakter ein durchschnittliches Niveau und Milieu der Leserschaft”. For the characterization of the Greek in *Hermas* as being “close to conversational street language”, see, e.g., OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 15, referring to J.C. WHITE, *The Interaction of Language and World in the Shepherd of Hermas* (PhD thesis, Temple University, 1973), pp. 161–165. It should be noted that Hermas himself comments on his own limited literacy in *Vis.* 2,1,4, where it is stated that Hermas is unable to distinguish the syllables of the message revealed by the woman church. For the characterization of the work as being typical of “a predominantly oral culture”, see, e.g., OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 21. See further, e.g., EHRMAN, *Shepherd*, p. 167: Hermas’ “somewhat superficial theological reflections” (among other characteristics like his literary skills) indicate that “he was not among the intellectual elite in the church”.

72 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 21: “He was probably a small craftsman and/or businessman”. See also LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 132: “Handwerker oder Händler”. Hermas’ crafts or business have been discussed for a long time. See, e.g., HILHORST, *Hermas*, p. 683 (“H. [Hermas] [gehörte] dem Stand der kleinen Geschäftsleute [an]”); JEFFERS, *Conflict at Rome*, p. 23 (viticulture: see, e.g., *Man.* 11,15,18; 12,5,3; *Sim.* 2; and 9,26,4); J. RÜPKE, *Apokalyptische Salzberge. Zum sozialen Ort und zur literarischen Strategie des ‘Hirten des Hermas’*, in *ARelG* 1 (1999) 148–160 (salt mining: see, e.g., *Vis.* 3,1,2); and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 21 with nn. 158–159 (trade or commerce: see, e.g., *Vis.* 3,6,7). It is, however, hard to determine whether Hermas was a winegrower, salt miner, building constructor (see esp. *Vis.* 3 and *Sim.* 9), etc.

73 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 21. See also, e.g., HILHORST, *Hermas*, pp. 686–687, following ZAHN, *Hirt*, p. 486 (“H. [Hermas] ist ein Mann aus dem Volke”).

74 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 21: “Nonelite does not necessarily mean economically poor, however”; and p. 23: “The portrayal of the central character Hermas is of a moderately wealthy freedman and householder”. Hermas’ direct addressees are always the better-off (see, e.g., *Vis.* 3,9,7), never the poor (with OSIEK, *Rich and Poor, passim*). See also MAIER, *Social Setting*, p. 64: “Hermas’ discussion of wealth assumes a degree of relative wealth on the part of some in the community, including especially its leaders”.

75 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 21: “All evidence indicates a nonelite Greek-speaking context with limited literary education”, and “If Hermas was a freedman, most of his associates were as well”.

76 Cf. LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 133: “Eine gewisse Kenntnis stoischer Moralphilosophie läßt die Paränese des Hermas erkennen. Jedoch ist der Einfluß der Stoa auf das Denken des Hermas keinesfalls mehr als oberflächlich”.

1.2.3 Opponents

It has been argued that, “Depending on the date of the final edition of the text, it is possible that Valentinus, Cerdo, Marcion, and Marcellina had all arrived in Rome and were teaching there . . . References to false, evil, and would-be teachers . . . indicate theological tensions in the church”.⁷⁷ Opponents who are mentioned in *Hermas* have been identified as church members, or as members of “heretical” groups. The “teachers” (διδάσκαλοι) in *Man.* 4,3,1 are no “heretics”, because the Shepherd later on (v. 2) agrees with them in principle: their teachings on μετάνοια are not incompatible, but complementary.⁷⁸ The ψευδοπροφήτης in *Man.* 11 does not seem to be a “heretic” either, because the soothsayer is not accused of any false teaching.⁷⁹ The “hypocrites” (ὑποκριταί) who “have introduced other teachings (διδαχὰς ἑτέρας εἰσφέροντες, *Sim.* 8,6,5) have been identified as “heretics” of various kinds,⁸⁰ but are more likely to be Christian teachers with different views on μετάνοια than Hermas (μὴ ἀφιόντες

77 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 22 with nn. 165–166 (with refs. to Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4,10–11; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1,25,6; 1,27,2–3; resp. *Vis.* 3,7,1; *Man.* 11,1; *Sim.* 5,7,2; 8,6,5; 9,19,2–3; and 9,22,1). She adds (*ibid.*): “For Hermas, these theological disagreements were not at the center of concern”.

78 See also, e.g., DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 508: “Es kann also keine Rede davon sein, daß die διδάσκαλοι einer häretischen Lehre anhängen”; BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 210–211: “Die Lehrer . . . halten also streng daran fest, daß es nur die eine Buße in der Taufe gibt . . . H[ermas] sieht in ihnen keine Häretiker oder Sonderlinge . . . Aber ‘die’ Lehrer der Kirche, d.h. deren einzige und für H[ermas] fraglos maßgeblichen Repräsentanten sind sie auch nicht, sondern es sind ‘einige (τινές)’”; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 114: “There is no evidence that they are members of heretical groups, but it is not clear whether they represent mainstream thinking in the Roman church or a minority position”.

79 See also, e.g., DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 540: “ein . . . [christlicher] Wahrsager”; BROX, *Hirt*, p. 265: “Hier ist es das Thema der Prophetie im Konflikt mit der Mantik im Christentum sowie die Unterscheidung der Geister (deren dualer Charakter als solcher den H[ermas] faszinieren mußte)”; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 142: “The previous discussion of the presence of both good and bad spirits in the baptized (especially *Man.* 6) makes it likely that both the false and true prophet are Christian . . . Nor is the soothsayer accused of false teaching, and so cannot be called a heretic”.

80 For the idea that Montanists are involved, see, esp. CROMBIE, *Pastor*, p. 41 n. 8: “it marks the Montanist refusal to receive penitent lapsers”. For the idea that Gnostics are meant, DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 596–597: “heuchlerische Irrlehrer . . . Als ihr wesentlichstes Merkmal wird erwähnt, daß sie die Sünder von der Buße zurückhalten. Das kann auf Gnostiker gehen . . . Dan wäre auch *Sim.* IX 22 zu vergleichen; andererseits hat die Erwähnung der Heuchelei und die Verwandtschaft mit den Unbußfertigen in *Sim.* IX 19 2 eine Parallele. Genaues läßt sich also hier nicht ausmachen”; and JOLY, *Hermas*, p. 277 n. 5: “Il semble qu’il y ait des traces, dans le *Pasteur*, de réactions contre la gnose ou des gnosés différents”. Cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 370: “Häretiker. Der Inhalt ihrer Falschlehren wird nicht mitgeteilt”.

αὐτοὺς μετανοεῖν).⁸¹ The “(hypocrites and) teachers of evil” ([ὑποκριταὶ καὶ] διδάσκαλοι πονηρίας) in *Sim.* 9,19,2 have been regarded as “heretics” (Gnostics),⁸² but they are described as false Christian teachers of unknown teachings.⁸³ The “believers” (οἱ πιστεύσαντες) in *Sim.* 9,22 who “wish to know (γινώσκειν) everything, but do not know anything at all (οὐδὲν ὅλως γινώσκουσι, v. 1)”, or “wannabe-teachers” (ἐθέλοδιδάσκαλοι, v. 2), have been taken as Gnostics.⁸⁴ But the use of γινώσκειν does not per definition imply that “Gnostics” are meant.⁸⁵ The teachers involved may well be church members who, in the eyes of Hermas, need to submit themselves to those who do have insight (σύνεσις), that is, to “proper” Christian teachers (v. 3).⁸⁶ In the three last-mentioned passages, the

-
- 81 See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 207, who thinks that heterodox teachings are involved: “It does not seem that they have separated from the community, but that they are in fact very influential within it, especially since they are distinguished from those with cracks . . . in 7.1”.
- 82 See, e.g., DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 628–629: “ob der Verf. [Verfasser] bei dieser Gruppe an Irrlehrer im allgemeinen denkt, ob er eine besondere Art im Auge hat, läßt sich hier so wenig feststellen wie bei der zweiten Gruppe in *Sim.* VIII 6 5 . . . Die Irrlehrer rechnen sich selbst zu den Christen . . . Was im übrigen hier gesagt wird, geht in den Bahnen der üblichen antignostischen Polemik . . .; man wird es also mit Gnostikern zu tun haben”. See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 445: “Ketzer . . . Die Heuchelei aus Gewinnsucht besteht in der Ablenkung der Christen durch ihr Geld, die nur noch scheinbar und oberflächlich eine Zugehörigkeit zur Gemeinde zuläßt”.
- 83 See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 245: “hypocrites and false teachers”. For the idea that they are (Christian) believers, see esp. v. 2: “they have the name, but are empty in faith” (ὄνομα μὲν ἔχουσιν, ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς πίστεως κενοὶ εἰσὶ). For their unspecified teachings, see esp. v. 3: “each of them has taught in accordance with the desires of the sinful people” (ἐδίδαξεν ἕκαστος κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἁμαρτανόντων).
- 84 DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 630, takes them as “christliche . . . Lehrer . . . zweifelhafter Art. Aus der offenbaren Anspielung mit γινώσκειν ist als sicher zu erschließen, daß es sich um Gnostiker handelt, aus der Polemik, die sich mehr gegen das Auftreten als gegen die Lehre richtet, daß noch keines der großen dualistischen Systeme gemeint ist”; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 24: “there are some similarities [with Gnosticism], and the description given here could sound like a bad caricature of Gnostics”.
- 85 BROX, *Hirt*, p. 447: “H[ermas] hat Leute im Visier, deren Anspruch, im Christentum kompetent und Lehrer zu sein, für ihn zweifelhaft ist und nicht anerkannt werden kann. Anders als die in 19,2 angegriffenen Irrlehrer haben sie aber den Glauben . . . Vorwurf von Stolz, Dreistigkeit und Ignoranz entspricht zwar der frühkirchlichen Polemik gegen die Gnostiker, denen—wie hier—gesagt wird, daß gerade sie, die alles zu wissen behaupten, eben nichts wissen. Aber das zweimalige γινώσκειν (22,1) ist keine genügend stabile Basis, diese abgelehnten Lehrer für gnostisch zu halten”.
- 86 DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 631: “Unterwerfung unter die Gemeindelehrer”. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 448, takes the people involved as “rebellious” community members (“gegenüber Lehre und

opponents are said to have a chance to change and to be saved. This indicates that no great “heresies” are meant.⁸⁷

2 Research Question and Methodology

The issues discussed above show that a reconstruction of the historical community(-ies) behind the text of *Hermas* is highly problematic. As this is the case, the present study changes the scope of research and investigates the “constructed community”, that is to say, the image of the “actual” (not the “ideal”)⁸⁸ community which the author Hermas created, rather than the one he experienced.

The study underlying this thesis has made use of a historical-critical methodology: it has analysed the author’s purposes by means of a detailed examination of the text. A thematic approach has been chosen to explore Hermas’ views on various aspects of the Christian community.

3 The Present Study

The following chapters will highlight, in arbitrary order, various aspects of the constructed community in *Hermas*. As with every thematic study, the list of topics that are dealt with is not exhaustive.⁸⁹ Some entries proved to be more fruitful than others.

The thesis consists of three parts. The chapters are numbered consecutively. The first part is on four aspects of identity: the relation to Judaism (*Vorlage*), the views on the resurrection (“theology”), the stance on outsiders (“the others”) and the position on the authorities (“friend”, “enemy”?). In Chapter 1 it will be argued that there is no basis for designating Hermas’ community as “Jewish Christian”. In Chapter 2 it will be contended that Hermas

Lehrern unbotmäßige . . . Gemeindechristen, [die] es sich in der römischen Gemeinde gegeben haben muß”).

87 See also DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 631 (on *Sim.* 9,22,4): “Das auffallend milde Urteil zeigt, daß der Verf. [Verfasser] noch nicht die großen dualistischen Systeme im Auge hat; insofern ist die Stelle für die Datierung wichtig”.

88 As OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 36, states (against others, see refs. there): in *Hermas*, the actual church and the ideal church “are represented throughout the ecclesial images”.

89 There is, for instance, no chapter on church offices (cf. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 22: “Hermas has very little to say about local church structure”). And a topic like the reading of Scripture will only be discussed in passing (see Chapter 1).

does not portray Jesus as the risen-one and does not seem to envision a resurrection of the dead. In Chapter 3 it will be pointed out that *Hermas* shows “sectarian” tendencies. In Chapter 4 it will be suggested that in the eyes of *Hermas* the addressees were too submissive to the authorities, but that there is no evidence that they participated in the emperor cult.

The second part studies two social aspects: the role of women and “charity”. In Chapter 5 it will be argued that women may have had an important role in society (e.g. Rhoda) and in the Christian community (e.g. Grapte), but that for *Hermas* a household with a *paterfamilias* and a Christian community with male leaders was the preferable setting. In Chapter 6 it will be contended that for *Hermas* charity is a pious duty in the self-interest of the giver.

The third part concerns five ritual aspects: baptism and μετάνοια (which are closely related), community meals, the Sunday collection, dancing (and singing) and the “holy kiss”. In Chapter 7 it will be shown that in *Hermas* baptism by immersion is assumed to be the usual initiation rite, and that μετάνοια does not involve any ritual, but means one’s personal change. In Chapter 8 it will be argued that *Hermas* and his addressees were familiar with Eucharistic community meals as real (filling) suppers. Chapter 9 will reject the idea that *Sim.* 9,26,2 would refer to a weekly collection of money in the Sunday gathering. In Chapter 10 it will be suggested that the dancing of *Hermas* and the virgins in *Sim.* 9,11,4–5 reflects an early Christian custom. In Chapter 11 it will be contended that *Sim.* 9,11,4 alludes to the exchange of the holy kiss.

Finally, the main results of the research on the eleven aspects just mentioned will be summarized in a general conclusion.

Jewish Christianity

Hermas is often designated as “Jewish Christian”.¹ Part of the difficulty in discussing the issue of Jewish Christianity is that there is no consensus on the meaning of the term. In the literature on *Hermas*, two main criteria have been used to designate the work as Jewish Christian.

- 1 R. HVALVIK, *Jewish Believers and Jewish Influence in the Roman Church until the Early Second Century*, in O. SKARSAUNE – R. HVALVIK (eds.), *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries*, Peabody, MA, Hendrickson, 2007, pp. 179–216, p. 213, states that “different scholars have emphasized either the Jewish or the pagan, Greco-Roman influences of the work”. But the general tendency is to emphasize the Jewish influences and to designate the work as “Jewish Christian”. See, e.g. (apart from the commentaries of DIBELIUS, *Hirt, passim*; BROX, *Hirt, passim*; and OSIEK, *Shepherd, passim*), J. DANIELLOU, *Théologie du judéo-christianisme* (BT.HD, 1), Paris, Desclée—Cerf, 1958, p. 67: “il y a des influences littéraires hellénistiques, mais le fond est judéo-chrétien”; B. BAGATTI, *The Church from the Circumcision: History and Archeology of the Judaeo-Christians* (trans. E. HOADE; PSBF.Mi, 2), Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 1971, p. 46, who designates *Hermas* as a literary work of “Judaeo-Christian influence”; F. MANNS, *L’Israël de Dieu. Essais sur le christianisme primitif* (SBFA, 42), Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 1996, p. 170: “[un texte] très proche du judaïsme” ... “les milieux judéo-chrétiens décrits par *Hermas*”; ID., *Le judéo-christianisme, mémoire ou prophétie?* (ThH, 112), Paris, Beauchesne, 2000, p. 33: “la communauté judéo-chrétienne de Rome aurait été fondée quelques années auparavant. La *Première épître de Clément* contient des éléments de la liturgie de cette Église, et le *Pasteur d’Hermas*, sa catéchèse”; S.C. MIMOUNI, *Le judéo-christianisme ancien. Essais historiques*, Paris, Cerf, 1998, p. 104: “Des œuvres aussi diverses que la *Didachè*, l’*Ascension d’Isaïe*, les *Odes de Salomon*, l’*Épître de Barnabé*, le *Pasteur d’Hermas* et le *Protévangile de Jacques* sont sans doute originaires de communautés judéo-chrétiennes”; and p. 456 n. 2: *Hermas* is “une œuvre judéo-chrétienne par excellence” (see also pp. 104, 229 n. 1.296 n. 2); and HOLMES, *Apostolic Fathers*, p. 442: “Expressing a Jewish-Christian theological perspective by means of imagery, analogies, and parallels drawn from Roman society and culture”.

Literature on Jewish Christianity that does not refer to *Hermas* includes A.F.J. KLIJN – G.J. REININK (eds.), *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects* (NT.S, 36), Leiden, Brill, 1973; J.E. TAYLOR, *Christians and the Holy Places: The Myth of Jewish-Christian Origins*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1993; J. CARLETON PAGET, *Jewish Christianity*, in W. HORBURY – W.D. DAVIES – J. STURDY (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism. III. The Early Roman Period*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp. 731–775; M.A. JACKSON-MCCABE (ed.), *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*, Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 2007; and P. LUOMANEN, *Recovering Jewish-Christian Sects and Gospels* (SVigChr, 110), Leiden, Brill, 2012. Unfortunately, it remains unclear whether these authors do not regard *Hermas* as a Jewish Christian text, or do not take *Hermas* into consideration.

A first criterion is based on some general assumptions about the historical setting of Jews and Christians in or near Rome in the time of *Hermas*. Osiek states that “first- and second-century Roman Christianity was . . . heavily influenced by a strong Jewish component”,² and that “*Hermas*’ relationship with contemporary Judaism is certain but not clear”.³ The lack of clarity, however, indicates that the Jewish influences on *Hermas* are in fact not so certain. She further writes: “The close connections between Judaism and Christianity in Rome in the late first and the early second century diminished as the second century progressed”.⁴ These developments in *Hermas*’ time indicate that one cannot simply start from the assumption that the author must have been influenced by contemporary Judaism. It is better to ask whether or not the work itself identifies its author or community somehow as Jewish Christian.

A second criterion is based on *Hermas*’ use of biblical or Jewish traditions. Dibelius thinks that much material found its way into *Hermas* through Jewish tradition.⁵ Brox believes that *Hermas*’ Christology and his views on the law have a Jewish Christian character because of their Jewish background and their reuse by the Christian author.⁶ Osiek argues that “the author is deeply influenced by both biblical traditions and some strands of Hellenistic Jewish teaching”.⁷ But Hvalvik rightly objects: “There is no doubt about the affinities shared between *Hermas* and ancient Jewish literature. There is, however, no basis for claiming that the author was a Jew or that he had close links to contemporary Judaism”.⁸ Accumulating as many biblical or Jewish parallels as possible is a dead end. There is no evidence that *Hermas* actually used any of these sources. Moreover, concerns for continuity with Scripture or Jewish tradition are not necessarily only the concern of “Jewish” Christians. Finally, it cannot be

2 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 21. For the idea that Rome was around the beginning of the second century an important Jewish centre, see, e.g., H. LEON, *The Jews of Ancient Rome*, Peabody, MA, Hendrickson, 1994, pp. 35–38.

3 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 24.

4 See OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, p. 119.

5 DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, esp. p. 424, states that the traditions in *Hermas* have various origins, but “häufig . . . werden diese Elemente erst indirekt, durch jüdische Vermittlung an *Hermas* gelangt sein”; “die Masse der Gebote beruht auf jüdischer Tradition”; and “Aus der jüdischen Tradition erklären sich weiter eine Anzahl Wendungen und Konstruktionen in der Sprache des *Hermas*”.

6 See BROX, *Hirt*, esp. pp. 328 (“Das alles scheint sehr judenchristlich entworfen”); 491, 494 (on the Son of God); and 362 (on the law).

7 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 25.

8 See HVALVIK, *Jewish Believers*, p. 214.

taken for granted that this continuity is indeed the author's concern. One can use biblical or Jewish material without being Jewish.

The present chapter will, therefore, address the issue differently. It will use as starting point Garleff's two-dimensional model. It will ask to what extent there is *continuity* and *differentiation* between Hermas and Judaism.⁹

1 Continuity

A first question is whether Hermas shows any interest in the Jewish origins of the church. Three issues will be dealt with. It will be asked whether Hermas identifies himself or his community as of a Jewish background, to what extent the Scriptures play a role of importance, and whether the author's views on community formation are connected to Jewish tradition.

1.1 Self-Identification

A small minority of commentators concludes that Hermas was a Christian of Jewish descent. Audet, for example, believes Hermas to be a descendant of a Qumran member who was imprisoned in 70 CE, enslaved and brought to Rome.¹⁰ Daniélou thinks that Hermas was an Essene who converted in Rome.¹¹ Lluís-Font too takes Hermas as a Christian of Essene origin.¹² More recently, Wilson has suggested that Hermas was perhaps brought up at Qumran and

9 For these criteria, see G. GARLEFF, *Urchristliche Identität in Matthäusevangelium, Didache und Jakobusbrief* (Beiträge zum Verstehen der Bibel, 9), Münster, LIT, 2004, pp. 26–47. For a survey of Garleff's framework, see also J. VERHEYDEN, *Jewish Christianity, A State of Affairs: Affinities and Differences with Respect to Matthew, James, and the Didache*, in H. VAN DE SANDT – J.K. ZANGENBERG (eds.), *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings* (SBLSymS, 45), Atlanta, GA, Society of Biblical Literature, 2008, pp. 123–135, p. 129. For recent discussions on the theme of Jewish Christianity, see esp. SKARSAUNE – HVALVIK, *Jewish Believers in Jesus* (esp. the contributions by O. SKARSAUNE, *Jewish Believers in Jesus in Antiquity: Problems of Definition, Method, and Sources*, pp. 3–21; and J. CARLETON PAGET, *The Definition of the Terms Jewish Christian and Jewish Christianity in the History of Research*, pp. 22–52); M.A. JACKSON-MCCABE, *What's in a Name? The Problem of 'Jewish Christianity'*, in ID., *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered*, pp. 7–38; and LUOMANEN, *Recovering Jewish-Christian Sects*, pp. 8–14.

10 J.-P. AUDET, *Affinités littéraires et doctrinales du Manuel de Discipline*, in *RB* 59 (1952) 219–238 and 60 (1953) 41–82, p. 82.

11 J. DANIÉLOU, *Les manuscrits de la Mer Morte et les origines du christianisme*, Paris, Éditions de l'Orante, 1957, pp. 120–122: "Un Essénien converti à Rome".

12 P. LLUIS-FONT, *Sources de la doctrine d'Hermas sur les deux esprits*, in *RAM* 39 (1963) 83–98, p. 97: "Hermas est un chrétien d'origine essénienne".

later lived in Rome.¹³ Apart from being far-fetched, these views are full of problems. First, there is no sufficient evidence for a direct link between *Hermas* and Qumran material.¹⁴ Second, it is unknown where *Hermas* came from. In *Vis.* 1,1,1 εἰς Ῥώμην can mean “to Rome”, but also “in Rome”, because in Hellenistic Greek ἐν and εἰς are often confused.¹⁵ Even if “to Rome” is meant, the place where *Hermas* came from is not mentioned. Finally, it is unknown whether *Hermas* was born a Christian or converted later in his life.¹⁶ “*Hermas* may be

-
- 13 J.C. WILSON, *Five Problems in the Interpretation of the Shepherd of Hermas: Authorship, Genre, Canonicity, Apocalyptic, and the Absence of the Name “Jesus Christ”* (Mellen Biblical Press Series, 34), Lewiston, NY – Queenston, ON – Lampeter, Mellen, 1995, pp. 38–50, esp. pp. 49–50.
- 14 See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 24–25. Studies on the relation between *Hermas* and Qumran include, e.g., AUDET, *Affinités, passim* (affinities/agreements between *Hermas* and the *Manual of Discipline*); A. DUPONT-SOMMER, *Nouveaux aperçus sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (OAI, 5), Paris, Maisonneuve, 1953, p. 200 n. 17 (following Audet, “rapprochements avec le *Pasteur d’Hermas*”); DANÉLOU, *Théologie du judéo-christianisme*, pp. 170.174.201 (connections between the Qumran documents and *Hermas*); LLUIS-FONT, *Sources*, p. 97 (“Le MD [Manuel de Discipline] et le Pasteur ne sont pas deux témoins parallèles, mais dépendents l’un de l’autre” [though, no literary dependence]); J.M. FORD, *A Possible Liturgical Background to the Shepherd of Hermas*, in *RdQ* 6 (1969) 531–551, p. 551 (“the theology of *The Shepherd* reflects that of Jewish ‘sectarian’ theology rather than the main stream of the ‘Temple Judaism’”); A.T. HANSON, *Hodayoth vi and viii and Hermas Sim. VIII*, in *StPatr* 10 = TU 107 (1970) 105–108, p. 108 (“*Hermas* had access to the Qumran tradition, and... was acquainted with the *Hodayoth* material in some form or other”). More recently, HVALVIK, *Jewish Believers*, p. 213, has argued that *Man.* 6,2,1–4 (cf. 12,1), where the Shepherd speaks about the angel of righteousness and the angel of wickedness in the heart of a human being, “has a close parallel in Qumran, in the *Rule of the Community* concerning the two spirits that God has put in men’s hearts: the spirits of truth and deceit (1 QS 3.13–4.26)”. He admits that “the similarities between the Qumran community and *Hermas* are not that close” (p. 214), but still believes that there are “parallels between *Hermas* and ancient Jewish literature, in particular to the Dead Sea Scrolls” (p. 214). Cf. JOLY, *Hermas*, p. 47, who argues (in reaction to Audet) that *Hermas*’ Jewishness should not be stressed too much, because the Christian character of the writing as well as its Hellenistic influences are clearly traceable: “Il a raison de souligner l’inspiration juive d’*Hermas*, mais nous avons l’impression que sa thèse trop exclusive l’amène à minimiser dangereusement le christianisme du *Pasteur* et même l’apport hellénique qu’il est facile d’y déceler”.
- 15 See, e.g., Mark 1,39, “in the whole of Galilee” (εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν). See also *Vis.* 2,4,3, where the woman church tells *Hermas* to read the booklet εἰς... τὴν πόλιν, which can only mean “in... the city”.
- 16 See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 25 n. 195. Cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 17: “als er [*Hermas*] den P[astor] H[ermae] schreibt, ist er Christ (seit wann?)”.

Jew or Gentile”.¹⁷ The author Hermas does not identify himself or his addressees as of a Jewish or a pagan background. For Hermas, this does not seem to be a matter of interest.

1.2 *Use of Biblical Language and Allusions*

Hilhorst argues that the Semitisms in *Hermas* reflect the language of the Greek bible.¹⁸ It is important to note that this does not prove any Jewish background or literary dependence on the Scriptures. There are no explicit citations from the bible and there are not many discernable allusions/echoes.

It has been taken for granted that for Hermas “the Hebrew Scriptures [were] of course available”, or that he knew the Greek bible.¹⁹ But this is uncertain. Hermas nowhere explicitly refers to “the Scriptures” in the sense of the Hebrew or Greek bible. The term αἱ γραφαί, which occurs only once (if original), refers not to “the Scriptures”, but to the three booklets in which Hermas writes down the revelation he receives.²⁰ And the phrase “what has been written before”

17 OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 23. Cf. OSIEK, *Oral World*, p. 155: “He [Hermas] is most likely, though not necessarily, of Jewish origin”.

18 HILHORST, *Sémitismes*, p. 185: “Dans l’ensemble, nous pouvons conclure qu’Hermas a pris ses sémitismes dans la Bible grecque et dans le milieu chrétien où on lisait cette Bible. Ils ne prouvent nullement qu’il connaissait des langues sémitiques”. See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 44 (following Hilhorst): “Die Erklärung der Semitismen ergibt sich also nicht aus einer semitischen Muttersprache des H[ermas]”.

19 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 24. Cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 44 (following HILHORST, *Sémitismes*, p. 185): “Die Semitismen . . . bedeuten . . . daß er sich die Semitismen aus der griechischen Bibel und im christlichen Milieu, wo man diese Bibel las, angeeignet hatte. Die Erklärung der Semitismen ergibt sich also . . . aus seiner Vertrautheit mit der griechischen Bibel und anderen frühchristlichen griechischen Schriften”.

20 For the term αἱ γραφαί, see *Vis.* 3,3,5. It is read by A (περὶ τὰς γραφάς) and L¹ (*circa scripturas*), but not by S Bo L² and E. It is rejected by WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN, but accepted by JOLY. A possible textcritical argument is that “scriptures” was an early introduction into the text at a time when *Hermas* was considered Scripture, and that the term was removed later. More likely, however, the original text read “scriptures”, a reading which was later removed by (a) copyist(s) who did not accept *Hermas* as “Scripture”. Among others, DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 464; and D. HELLHOLM, *Das Visionenbuch des Hermas*. 1, p. 132, conjecture ἐκζητήσεις, but this is unfounded. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 127, concludes: “Allerdings läßt sich für γραφάς keine wirklich plausible Erklärung nennen”. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 68, who puts the phrase between square brackets (p. 65), argues (following JOLY, *Hermas*, pp. 108–109), that αἱ γραφαί “need not mean Scripture, but could refer to the written portion of the revelation given to Hermas”. For the written revelation, see *Vis.* 2,1,3–4 and 2,4,3.

(τὰ [προ]γεγραμμένα) in *Sim.* 5,3,7 probably refers not to God's commandments in the bible, but to a previous part of Hermas' revelation.²¹

The idea that the Scriptures were available is based on the traditional and still current view that the reading of Scripture in Christian gatherings is a continuation of that in the Jewish synagogues.²² But rather than being a specifically Jewish practice, the reading probably finds its origin in the custom of reading out texts during the after-dinner symposium of contemporary Hellenistic associations.²³

21 See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 313. Pace, e.g., FUNK, *Hermae Pastor*, p. 535 n. 7: *Si lectio vera est, sunt mandata Domini in S. Scriptura proposita*. OSIĘK, *Shepherd*, p. 174, concludes that it refers to the commandments of God. M and L¹ read προγεγραμμένα (WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRLMAN). A reads γεγραμμένα (GEBHARDT – HARNACK; FUNK). L² reads *quae audisti*, maybe because the translator saw an inconsistency here, assuming that the previous oral instructions were meant.

22 See, e.g. G. DIX, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, Glasgow, Glasgow University Press, 1945²; repr. Westminster, Dacre, 1949, pp. 36–37; J.A. JUNGEMANN, *Missarum sollemnia. Eine genetische Erklärung der Römischen Messe*. 1. *Messe im Wandel der Jahrhunderte. Messe und kirchliche Gemeinschaft. Vormesse*, Wien – Freiburg im Breisgau – Basel, Herder, 1962⁵, pp. 25–26; J.N.D. KELLY, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles: 1 Timothy, 11 Timothy, Titus* (BNTC), London, Black, 1963, p. 105; C. PERROT, *The Reading of the Bible in the Ancient Synagogue*, in M.J. MULDER – H. SYSLING (eds.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (CRINT, 2/1), Assen – Maastricht, Van Gorcum; Philadelphia, PA, Fortress, 1988, pp. 137–159, p. 158; H.Y. GAMBLE, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*, New Haven, CT – London, Yale University Press, 1995, p. 208; ID., *Literacy, Liturgy, and the Shaping of the New Testament Canon*, in C. HORTON (ed.), *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels—The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex, P⁴⁵* (JSNTS, 258), London – New York, T&T Clark, 2004, pp. 27–39, pp. 33–35; G.A.M. ROUWHORST, *The Reading of Scripture in Early Christian Liturgy*, in L.V. RUTGERS (ed.), *What Athens Has to Do with Jerusalem: Essays on Classical, Jewish, and Early Christian Art and Archaeology in Honor of Gideon Foerster* (ISACR, 1), Leuven, Peeters, 2002, pp. 305–331, pp. 305, 318–322; F. YOUNG, *Christian Teaching*, in ID. – L. AYRES – A. LOUTH (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004, pp. 91–104, p. 91; and W.A. MEEKS, *Social and Ecclesial Life of the Earliest Christians*, in F.M. YOUNG – M.M. MITCHELL (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity*. 1. *Origins to Constantine*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006, pp. 145–173, p. 167.

23 I have argued this in my BA thesis at Leiden University under supervision of Professor Henk Jan de Jonge: M. GRUNDEKEN, *De oorsprong van de lezing van de Schrift in de christelijke samenkomst* (Leiden, 29 June 2005, unpublished). See also V.A. ALIKIN, *The Earliest History of the Christian Gathering: Origin, Development and Content of the Christian*

There is no evidence for the public reading of Jewish Scriptures in Christian gatherings before about 150 CE.²⁴ It has been argued that the references to the Scriptures in the letters of Paul are indirect evidence of the use of these texts in Christian gatherings from the middle of the first century onwards, because without this practice the scriptural knowledge of Gentile Christians would have been insufficient to follow Paul's line of reasoning.²⁵ But it cannot be assumed that Paul's addressees did follow or must have followed the apostle's argumentation. It has been put forward that 1 Tim 4,13 would be evidence for the public reading of Scripture in the Christian assembly around 100 CE.²⁶ It is true that the context of the public reading was probably the Christian assembly (though there are at least two other options: a classroom, like Justin Martyr's; or a gathering of only certain parts of the community, as in *Hermas Vis.* 2,4,3). But it remains uncertain which texts "Timothy" was supposed to read: the passage does not prove that *Scripture* was read. Perhaps some Christian texts or letters of correspondence are meant (as in *Vis.* 2,4,3). The earliest witness for the reading of Scripture in church gatherings is Justin Martyr, who writes that during the Sunday gathering the "memoirs of the apostles" (that is, the gospels) and "the writings of the prophets" (that is, the Old Testament prophetic writings) are read.²⁷

Gathering in the First to Third Centuries (SVigChr, 102), Leiden – Boston, MA, Brill, 2010, pp. 147–182.

- 24 See also, e.g., D.E. AUNE, *Worship, Early Christian*, in *ABD* 6 (1992) 973–989, p. 983: "There is no clear evidence that the OT was read in Christian worship before ca. AD 155".
- 25 J.C. SALZMANN, *Lehren und Ermahnen. Zur Geschichte des christlichen Wortgottesdienstes in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (WUNT 11, 59), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1994, p. 73: "Zum andern ist deutlich, daß Paulus sich auch im Ersten Korintherbrief auf die Schriften und auf jüdische Tradition bezieht und sie als bekannte Größen voraussetzt. . . . Die damit vorausgesetzte Vertrautheit mit den Schriften kann eigentlich nur durch einigermaßen regelmäßige Schriftlesungen erworben werden"; GAMBLE, *Books and Readers*, p. 212; and ROUWHORST, *Reading of Scripture*, p. 321.
- 26 See, e.g., KELLY, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 105; R.P. MARTIN, *Worship in the Early Church*, Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 1975, p. 70; C.E. COX, *The Reading of the Personal Letter as the Background for the Reading of the Scriptures in the Early Church*, in A.J. MALHERBE – F.W. NORRIS – J.W. THOMPSON (eds.), *The Early Church in Its Context. Essays in Honor of Everett Ferguson* (NT.S., 90), Leiden, Brill, 1998, pp. 74–91, pp. 84–85; ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, esp. p. 164; and H.J. DE JONGE, *The Use of the Old Testament in Scripture Readings in Early Christian Assemblies*, in B.J. KOET – S. MOYISE – J. VERHEYDEN (eds.), *The Scriptures of Israel in Jewish and Christian Tradition. Essays in Honour of Maarten J.J. Menken* (NT.S., 148), Leiden, Brill, 2013, pp. 377–392.
- 27 For the "memoirs of the apostles", see Justin Martyr, *1 Apol.* 67,3 (ed. MINNS – PARVIS). In 66,3 it is explained that these "memoirs" are the gospels. For the "writings of the prophets",

In the early years of Christianity, copies of biblical writings were for most Christian communities probably too costly.²⁸ It cannot be assumed that Hermas' community was an exception.

The earliest evidence indicates that early Christian communities originally read their own (Christian) texts, especially letters.²⁹ *Hermas* is a witness to this practice.³⁰ Whereas the reading of Jewish Scriptures is nowhere mentioned, Hermas seems to have been acquainted with the reading of Christian texts which were composed to be read in the community gatherings. It is narrated how Hermas writes down the revelations by the woman church in a booklet which he copies twice.³¹ Hermas is asked to read the message to the presbyters

see 1 *Apol.* 67,3. See also Irenaeus, *Haer.* 2,27,2 (ed. BROX), where the term "prophets" (*propheticae*) refers to the Prophets of (what later became known as) the Old Testament: "all Scriptures, the Prophets as well as the gospels" (*universae scripturae et propheticae et evangelicae*).

28 See A. VON HARNACK, *Das Alte Testament in den paulinischen Briefen und in den paulinischen Gemeinden*, in *SBAW.PH* (1928) 124–141; and W. BAUER, *Der Wortgottesdienst der ältesten Christen*, in *Id., Aufsätze und Kleine Schriften*, ed. G. STRECKER, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1967, pp. 155–209, pp. 190–193.

29 See esp. 1 Thess 5,27 and Acts 15,31. See also Col 4,16; Rev 1,3,10–11; 22,18; and 1 *Clem.* 65,1. 1 *Clem.* 65,1 (ed. EHRMAN) indicates that 1 *Clement* was read aloud in the Christian assembly at Corinth by Roman messengers (A. LINDEMANN, *Die Clemensbriefe* [HNT, 17; Die Apostolischen Väter, 1], Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1992, pp. 180–181, does not note this). Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4,23,11 (ed. BARDY [with some adaptations]) indicates that 1 *Clement* was read not just once, but repeatedly in the Corinthian Sunday gathering. Eusebius mentions an epistle of Dionysius, bishop of Corinth (4,23,1), addressed to Soter, bishop of Rome (4,23,10): "In this same letter, he also mentions the epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, showing that from the beginning it had been the custom to read it in the church. He says: 'today we spent the Lord's holy day, in which we have read your epistle, which we will always be able to use, when we read it, for advice, as with the previous one that was written to us by Clement'" (ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ ταύτῃ καὶ τῆς Κλήμεντος πρὸς Κορινθίους μέμνηται ἐπιστολῆς, δηλῶν ἀνέκαθεν ἐξ ἀρχαίου ἔθους ἐπὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν αὐτῆς ποιεῖσθαι· λέγει γοῦν· τὴν σήμερον οὖν κυριακὴν ἁγίαν ἡμέραν διηγάγομεν, ἐν ᾗ ἀνέγνωμεν ὑμῶν τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, ἣν ἔξομεν αἰεὶ ποτε ἀναγινώσκοντες νουθετεῖσθαι, ὡς καὶ τὴν προτέραν ἡμῖν διὰ Κλήμεντος γραφείσαν).

30 See *Vis.* 2,4,3. See also, e.g., LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, pp. 105–497, p. 403 n. 227: "das Buch [war] ursprünglich für den mündlichen Vortrag bestimmt"; and ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, p. 201: "He [Hermas] wrote at least part of his work as texts to be read as homilies".

31 See *Vis.* 2,1,3–4 and 2,4,3. Hermas' "copy" is, in fact, not a copy, but a dictation, as JOLY, *Hermas*, p. 90 n. 1, rightly remarks. According to K. HAINES-EITZEN, *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000, p. 40, "Hermas . . . illustrates the private modes of text copying and transmission that were operative for Christianity's earliest centuries".

who lead the church in his city.³² Grapte is to use her copy to admonish the widows and orphans, and Clement is to send his copy to the Christian communities in the other cities.³³ Most likely, the setting in which the booklets are meant to be read is the weekly assembly of the community. It appears that Hermas was familiar with the phenomenon of Christian texts being written, copied and sent round to be read in the community gatherings. For Hermas, it is not so much the Scriptures as the new documents of the church that matter.

1.3 Moral Teaching

Koester and with him Osiek argue that underlying *Hermas* there is a "Hellenistic Jewish tradition of moral teaching, much of it based on the Two Ways".³⁴ Concerning the moral teaching in the *Mandates*, Osiek states that "always the aim is the formation of the Christian community along the lines of Jewish wisdom paraenesis".³⁵ The Two Ways material in *Hermas* (e.g., in *Man.* 6,1) is, however, not specifically Jewish.³⁶ The same counts for two-way

32 See *Vis.* 2,2,6 and 2,4,3.

33 For Grapte and Clement, see *Vis.* 2,4,3.

34 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 24. See further KOESTER, *Einführung*, pp. 693–697: "Die Gestalt der 'Kirche' ... in den ersten drei Visionen ... geht auf die jüdische Gestalt der Weisheit zurück" (p. 694); "Aus traditionellem jüdischen Material besteht auch der zweite Teil der Schrift, die *Mandata*" (p. 695); and "Dem dritten Teil des Hermashirtens liegt eine Sammlung von Parabeln (*Similitudines*) zugrunde, die sicher jüdischer Herkunft ist" (p. 696). See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 189: "Gemeinsam ist weiter [for the *Mandates*] die deutliche Rezeption ethischer Tradition, und zwar jüdischer Provenienz".

35 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 103.

36 See, e.g., C. TAYLOR, *The Two Ways in Hermas and Xenophon*, in *JP* 21 (1893) 243–258, esp. p. 257: *Hermas* shows "a general acquaintance with the Christian and other forms of the *Two Ways*"; E. KAMLAH, *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament* (WUNT, 7), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1964, pp. 207–210, 214–215 (who argues for an Iranian origin); and J.P. MARTÍN, *Espíritu y dualismo de espíritus en el Pastor de Hermas y su relación con el judaísmo*, in *VetChr* 15 (1978) 295–345, pp. 316–318, who argues that the Two Ways material in *Hermas* reflects a variety of both Jewish and pagan texts and concludes (p. 318): "No es posible encerrar el texto de HS [*Hermas*] en ninguno de estos antecedentes por sí solos. Ninguno de ellos ofrece todos los elementos de la redacción de HS, pero todos ellos, en su conjunto, iluminan el ambiente literario en el que se debe interpretar el texto de HS" ("It is not possible to fully understand the text of *Hermas* against the background of these motifs alone. None of these contain all elements of the redaction of *Hermas*, yet, taken together, shed light on the literary context within which one can interpret the text of *Hermas*"). See also the critical remark of K. SYREENI, *The Sermon on the Mount and the Two Ways Teaching of the Didache*, in H. VAN DE SANDT (ed.), *Matthew and the Didache*:

parenetic teaching in general: it is widely used in Greco-Roman and other sources as well.³⁷ It may be true that *Hermas* shows several patterns of Jewish moral teaching (like an emphasis on prayer, fasting, almsgiving, and so on),³⁸ but these may well derive from Christian tradition. Finally, it is doubtful that the author's aim is to build up the church "along the lines" of Jewish tradition. It is not the Jewish background that is stressed, but the fact that the church has gone its own way (see esp. *Sim.* 9,17,1–2). *Hermas* does not emphasize any continuity with Jewish tradition.

Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?, Assen, Van Gorcum; Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 2005, pp. 87–103, p. 92: "In all cases, both the Barnabas and Didache renderings of the Two Ways are Christian products and there is no guarantee that their immediate *Vorlagen* were purely Jewish documents". Pace, e.g., MIMOUNI, *Le judéo-christianisme*, pp. 201, 245, who takes the Two Ways terminology in *Hermas* as evidence that the text is Jewish Christian. Cf. O.J.F. SEITZ, *Antecedents and Signification of the Term Δίψυχος*, in *JBL* 66 (1947) 211–219, p. 218: "the doctrine of the Two Ways, which is found not only in the Didache and Barnabas, but also in Mandate VI of The Shepherd, is itself a Jewish conception . . ."; M.J. SUGGS, *The Christian Two Ways Tradition: Its Antiquity, Form, and Function*, in D.E. AUNE (ed.), *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature. Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren* (NT.S., 33), Leiden, Brill, 1972, pp. 60–74, p. 64: "The content of the Two Ways is thoroughly Jewish"; and p. 72: "The Christian Two Ways tradition . . . stands in continuity with a Jewish Two Spirits/Ways tradition"; W. RORDORF, *Un chapitre d'éthique judeo-chrétienne. Les deux voies*, in *RSR* 60 (1972) 109–128 (the Two Ways ethical teaching originates from an Essene tradition); K. NIEDERWIMMER, *Die Didache* (KAV, 1), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989, pp. 83–88, who admits that Two Ways traditions are found in a variety of ancient texts, yet concludes: "Die Christen haben dann das ganze aus der jüdischen Überlieferung übernommen"; and H. VAN DE SANDT, *James 4,1–4 in the Light of the Jewish Two Ways Tradition* 3,1–6, in *Bib.* 88 (2007) 38–63, *passim*, who assumes a Jewish background ("an earlier Jewish Two Ways document which is no longer known to us", p. 38).

- 37 See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 24. Cf. p. 31: "There is now consensus on the pre-Qumran Jewish origins of this tradition, probably with Iranian influence, though the more general theme of two paths, perhaps even of two spirits, is also known in Greco-Roman context". Unfortunately, it is unclear whether she means that only the general theme of two paths/spirits, or the Two Ways tradition as such is not specifically Jewish. Cf. p. 123: "two-way paraenetic theology has roots in both Greek and Jewish moral traditions". A similar lack of clarity counts for Brox's commentary. Compare BROX, *Hirt*, p. 225: "schon altgriechische . . . Zwei-Wege-Metapher"; with p. 226: "Daß nach 1,2 [*Man.* 6,1,2] der rechte Weg gerade, der unrechte krumm ist, kann für jüdisch-christliche Tradition sprechen".
- 38 For prayer, see, e.g., *Vis.* 1,1,3–4; 2,1,2–3; 3,1,1,6–7; 4,1,7–8; 5,1; and *Sim.* 5,1,1. For fasting, *Vis.* 1,2,4; 2,2,1; 3,1,1; 3,9,6–7; and *Sim.* 5,1,1–5. For giving to the needy, *Vis.* 3,9,2; *Man.* 2,4; and 8,10.

2 Differentiation

A further question is to what extent Hermas demarcates the present situation of the church from the past. Three topics will be dealt with: the authority and identity of the Son of God (Jesus), the Jewish origins of the church and the Jewish law.

2.1 *Beyond Jewish Categories*

For Osiek, Hermas' views on the Son of God (Jesus) form "an impressive list of biblically rooted titles, images, and affirmations about the character and work of the son of God".³⁹ She leaves two important questions unanswered. The first is whether Hermas ascribes characteristics to the Son of God that differ from traditional Jewish categories. The second is whether *Hermas* testifies to any Jewish-Christian controversies on the authority or identity of Jesus, for instance by affirming or rejecting certain Christological positions.

2.1.1 The Son of God

Hermas' views on the Son of God are not typically Jewish. The Son is, for instance, not presented as the Messiah, Son of David, or the fulfilment of promises in the Scriptures.

Hermas shows an awareness of the triad of Father, Spirit and Son.⁴⁰ In *Sim.* 5.5,2 the Lord (God), the Holy Spirit and the Son of God are mentioned together.⁴¹ The Lord, Spirit and (adopted)⁴² Son belong to the same family.

39 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 35.

40 *Ibid.*, p. 36. Cf. BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 327–328.378, who argues that in some passages in *Hermas* there is a "binitarian" trend in the "trinitarian" scheme, yet rightly contends that it goes too far to designate Hermas' views as "trinitarian" (p. 489).

41 *Sim.* 5.5,2: ὁ δὲ κύριος τοῦ ἀγροῦ ὁ κτίσας τὰ πάντα . . . [ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιόν ἐστιν]· ὁ δὲ δοῦλος ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν. It is important to note that the son of the parable is not the Son of God, but the Holy Spirit; it is the slave who represents God's Son. The phrase "the son is the Holy Spirit" is not preserved in Greek, but only in Latin (L¹, *filius autem spiritus sanctus est*): it is missing in A L² and E (and part of a lacuna in M). It is accepted by WHITTAKER (brackets); LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN (see also DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 569; BROX, *Hirt*, p. 316; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 177). It is more probable that it was omitted than that it was added. The longer reading is the *lectio difficilior*. Most likely, it was omitted by copyists who were either puzzled by or unwilling to accept the crossing of characters (son—Spirit, slave—Son), the identification of the s/Son with the Spirit, or the positing of two s/Sons.

42 See, e.g., A. GRILLMEIER, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche*. 1. *Von der Apostolischen Zeit bis zum Konzil von Chalcedon* (451), Freiburg im Breisgau – Basel – Wien, Herder, 1979,

It goes too far to conclude that Hermas' views are "trinitarian". They are not "binitarian" either.⁴³ It is true that the distinction between Son and Spirit sometimes gets blurred, but the two are not equated.⁴⁴ Hermas envisions three distinct "characters" (if this is an appropriate term): one God with one full son (the Holy Spirit) and one adopted son (the Son of God).⁴⁵ Father, Son and Spirit are not connected with a specifically Jewish background.⁴⁶

God's Son is both lawgiver (*Sim.* 5,6,3) and the law (*Sim.* 8,3,2). The fact that the Son of God personifies the law indicates that he is already exalted. Schweitzer takes the law as that of the Old Testament.⁴⁷ Osiek argues that Hermas means the new law of Christ "in continuity with Torah".⁴⁸ But there is no reason to assume any continuity with the Jewish law. *Sim.* 8,3,7 refers to "those who were persecuted because of the law, but did not suffer and did not deny their law".⁴⁹ Most likely, the law for which believers are persecuted is meant to be the "Christian" law (see *Sim.* 1) or Christ himself. As personification

p. 159 (on *Sim.* 5): "Eine deutlich adoptionistische Christologie". Cf., e.g., J. LEBRETON, *Histoire du dogme de la Trinité. Des origines au Concile de Nicée*. II. *De Saint Clément a Saint Irénée* (BTH), Paris, Beauchesne, 1928³, p. 368: Hermas "ne mentionne plus la récompense accordée à l'esclave: l'adoption"; and DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 573: "aus dieser . . . Allegorie [kann] keine adoptionistische Christologie erschlossen werden".

43 Cf. LEBRETON, *Trinité*, p. 371: "on chercherait en vain dans sa théologie une trinité de personnes divines; on n'y trouverait que ce qu'on a appelé une théologie binitaire, distinguant en Dieu le Père et l'Esprit-Saint"; DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 574: "binitarische[r] Monotheismus"; GRILLMEIER, *Jesus der Christus*, p. 145: "Bis zu einem gewissen Grade erlaubt dies die Annahme eines trinitarischen oder zumindest binitarischen (Vater-Sohn) Glaubens"; BROX, *Hirt*, p. 327: "binitarische[r] Trend"; OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 181: "perhaps binitarian"; and B.G. BUCUR, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology: Clement of Alexandria and Other Early Christian Witnesses* (SVigChr, 95), Leiden, Brill, 2009, pp. 137–138: "the *Shepherd* was aware of trinitarian formulas. Nevertheless, most of this writing's theology displays a marked binitarian orientation".

44 See *Sim.* 9,1,1. See also, e.g., ZAHN, *Hirt*, pp. 278–280; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 212. Pace DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 602; and BROX, *Hirt*, p. 378. Cf. GRILLMEIER, *Jesus der Christus*, p. 338: "die Identifikation von präexistentem Christus mit dem Heiligen Geist", with in n. 47 a reference to *Herm. Sim.* 9,1,1 and 5,6,5.

45 See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 378; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 36. Brox, however, uses the term (three) "persons" ("Personen")—an anachronistic term that should be avoided.

46 Cf. BAGATTI, *Church from the Circumcision*, p. 46: "the substratum is eminently Judaeo-Christian if for nothing else than the Trinitarian concept which is developed on the basis of the angels".

47 See V. SCHWEITZER, *Der Pastor Hermae und die opera supererogatoria*, in *ThQ* 86 (1904) 539–556, p. 545.

48 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 179. See also BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 361–362.

49 *Sim.* 8,3,7: ὑπὲρ τοῦ νόμου θλιβέντες, μὴ παθόντες δὲ μηδὲ ἀρνησάμενοι τὸν νόμον αὐτῶν.

of the law, the Son of God exceeds the authority of any other law and, thus, also of the Jewish law.

God's Son is the foundation of all creation, including the church. He is compared to a huge, ancient rock.⁵⁰ It is explained that the rock is old because the Son pre-exists creation and acted as advisor of his Father when everything was created.⁵¹ The Son is also the foundation of the church. In *Sim.* 9,3,1 the tower, which represents the church, is built on a rock.⁵² It is implied that the church is "founded" on the Son of God. In *Sim.* 9,14,4 Hermas asks the Shepherd why the tower is not built on the ground, but on the rock. The Shepherd replies that "the name of the Son of God . . . sustains (βαστάζει) the whole world. If all creation is carried (βαστάζεται) by the Son of God, what do you think of those who were called by him (τοὺς κεκλημένους ὑπ' αὐτοῦ) and carry (φοροῦντας) the name of the Son of God and go forth in his commandments? Do you see whom he carries (ποιοῦς βαστάζει)? It is those who carry (φοροῦντας) his name with whole their heart. He has become a fundament (θεμέλιος) to them and carries (βαστάζει) them with pleasure, because they are not ashamed to carry (φορεῖν) his name" (vv. 5–6). The Son of God sustains all creation, including the community of believers.⁵³ God's Son is the foundation of the cosmos and

50 See *Sim.* 9,2,1: "the rock was higher than the mountains . . . so that it could contain the whole world" (ἡ δὲ πέτρα ὑψηλοτέρα ἦν τῶν ὀρέων . . . ὥστε δύνασθαι ὅλον τὸν κόσμον χωρῆσαι); and v. 2: "ancient was this rock" (παλαιὰ δὲ ἦν ἡ πέτρα ἐκείνη). For the identification of the rock with the Son of God, see *Sim.* 9,12,1: "this rock . . . is the Son of God" (ἡ πέτρα . . . αὕτη . . . ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶ).

51 See *Sim.* 9,12,2: "The Son of God is older than all his creation, so that he was advisor for the Father concerning his creation" (ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ πάσης τῆς κτίσεως ᾧ αὐτοῦ προγενέστερός ἐστιν, ὥστε σύμβουλον αὐτὸν γενέσθαι τῷ πατρὶ τῆς κτίσεως αὐτοῦ). There are two major textual problems here (see also LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 322): ^r *txt* A C^a, θεοῦ L², *om.* L¹ E; ^r *txt* A, αὐτοῦ περὶ τῆς κτίσεως C^s (L¹), αὐτοῦ περὶ ὅλης τῆς κτίσεως E (L²). The two problems are interrelated: the issue is, whose creation is meant. The readings as attested in A are twice the *lectio difficilior*. In the first instance, αὐτοῦ (A) is ambivalent; the reading of L² (θεοῦ) a clarification; and the reading of L¹ and E (*om.*) probably a means to do away with the ambivalence. In the second instance, αὐτοῦ after κτίσις (A) is of all variants the most confusing one, because it leaves open whether the Son or the Father is meant. The other witnesses read αὐτοῦ directly after "Father", which is a clarification. Therefore, the readings of A are to be preferred. See also WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN.

52 See *Sim.* 9,3,1: the six men are commanded "to build a tower on the rock" (οἰκοδομεῖν ἐπάνω τῆς πέτρας πύργον τινα). For an identification of the tower with the church, see esp. *Sim.* 9,13,1.

53 GRILLMEIER, *Jesus der Christus*, p. 145, concludes on the basis of *Sim.* 9,14,6: "Nach dem Hirten des Hermas kommt dem Namen des Gottessohnes göttliche Ehre und Funktion zu". But "godly" goes too far. At this point, HVALVIK, *Jewish Believers*, p. 214, argues that the

of the church. In *Hermas* cosmological and ecclesiological Christology are closely related.⁵⁴

God's Son is not only the rock/foundation on which the tower/church is built, but also its door/access.⁵⁵ It is stated that the door is new⁵⁶ because the Son was made known "in the last days of the completion".⁵⁷ With these days, the final building stage of the tower is meant, that is, the end time.⁵⁸ Whereas the rock is old, the door is new. The fact that the door is new is clearly a Christian element in the story: the door reflects the new means of "access" to God.⁵⁹ According to *Sim.* 9,4,6–8, there is no entry into the tower except through the door, which means that there is no salvation except through the Son. In *Sim.* 9,12,3–8 it is repeatedly stated and, thus, strongly emphasized that it is through the Son that there is salvation and entrance into God's kingdom. It is through the door (the Son) that those who will be saved enter into the kingdom of God (v. 3).⁶⁰ Only stones that go through the door are used for the building of the tower, which means that "no one will enter into the kingdom of God, except when one receives the name of his Son" (v. 4).⁶¹ A walled city with only one door can be accessed only through that door. Similarly, "no one can enter into the kingdom of God, except through the name of his beloved Son" (v. 5).⁶² "The tower is the Son of God: this is the only access to the Lord. Otherwise nobody will have access to him except through his Son" (v. 6).⁶³

focus on "the Name" is a "typical Jewish element", referring to *Jub.* 36,7 and *1 En.* 48,2–4. But in the passage in *Jub.*, "the name" refers to the one who "created heaven and earth", not to the Son of God. And *1 En.* is not about the Son of God, but the "Son of Man".

54 See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 236.

55 *Sim.* 9,12,1: "the gate is the Son of God" (ἡ πύλη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστί). See also 9,13,2 and 9,15,2.

56 See *Sim.* 9,2,2 and 9,12,1–3.

57 See *Sim.* 9,12,3: ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν τῆς συντελείας.

58 See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 233–234. Cf. *Vis.* 3,9,8, where similar language is used to refer to the completion of the building of the tower. It follows from *Sim.* 9,5,1, where the major part of the building process is finished, but some work still remains to be done, that the church is now in an interim period. So, the earthly presence of the historical figure of the Son of God (Jesus) marked the beginning of the end of time.

59 See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 220–223.

60 See *Sim.* 9,12,3: the door is new, "so that those who will be saved enter through it into the kingdom of God" (ἵνα οἱ μέλλοντες σώζεσθαι δι' αὐτῆς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν εἰσελθῶσι τοῦ θεοῦ).

61 See *Sim.* 9,12,4: εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ οὐδεὶς εἰσελεύσεται, εἰ μὴ λάβοι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ.

62 See *Sim.* 9,12,5: εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἄλλως εἰσελθεῖν οὐ δύναται ἄνθρωπος εἰ μὴ διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἡγαπημένου ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

63 See *Sim.* 9,12,6: ἡ δὲ πύλη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν· αὕτη μία εἰσοδὸς ἐστὶ πρὸς τὸν κύριον. ἄλλως οὖν οὐδεὶς εἰσελεύσεται πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰ μὴ διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ.

Even the angels must receive the name of the Son before they can enter God's kingdom (v. 8).

Another strikingly Christian statement is found in *Sim.* 8,11,1: "the Lord wants the calling which took place (through his Son?) to be saved (through his Son?)" (ὁ κύριος θέλει τὴν κλήσιν τὴν γενομένην διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ σωθῆναι). The question is whether the calling or the saving is through the Son.⁶⁴ It is difficult to decide between the two options, but the statement is in any case clearly Christian.

Finally, the Son is not only the foundation of and entrance to the tower, but also its lord (κύριος) and inspector.⁶⁵ The question arises whether Hermas regards the Son (Jesus) as *Lord*. Some scholars think that κύριος does not refer to the Son.⁶⁶ Others contend that it is "not a Christological title in the Shepherd, but so nearly represents that presence of God which in the NT is the Son, that it can approximate a Christological meaning".⁶⁷ Again others believe that in some passages it does refer to the Son.⁶⁸

In *Hermas* the use of κύριος is ambivalent. A good example is *Vis.* 2,2,8, where κύριος is used twice: "for the Lord (κύριος) has sworn on his Son that those who deny their Lord (τὸν κύριον αὐτῶν) will be denied their lives".⁶⁹ The first κύριος refers to God, but the second one is not so clear. Osiek thinks that it refers the first time to God and the second time to Christ.⁷⁰ Her argumentation

64 The translations of Dibelius, Brox and Osiek opt for the former. See DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 600: "der Herr [will], daß die Berufung, die durch seinen Sohn geschehen ist, bewahrt werde"; and BROX, *Hirt*, p. 351: "der Herr [will], daß alle gerettet werden, die durch seinen Sohn berufen sind". OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 199, translates: "the Lord... wants those called through his son to be saved", yet *comments*, on p. 210: "All who have received the call... of baptism are destined to be saved through God's son".

65 See *Sim.* 9,5,2,6; 9,6; 9,7,1; and 9,12,8. For the identification of the lord/inspector of the tower with the Son of God, see esp. *Sim.* 9,12,8.

66 See, e.g., AUDET, *Affinités* (1953), pp. 45, 50, 55–56. Audet uses this as an argument for the Jewish background of *Hermas*.

67 See SNYDER, *Shepherd*, p. 38.

68 See, e.g., W. BOUSSET, *Kyrios Christos. Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus* (FRLANT, 21), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921², p. 224 with n. 1; DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 470; K. HÖRMANN, *Leben in Christus. Zusammenhänge zwischen Dogma und Sitte bei den Apostolischen Vätern*, Wien, Herold, 1952, p. 191 n. 6: "Im PH [*Pastor Hermas*] wird Christus in den letzten Gleichnissen... einige Male Herr genannt"; NIJENDIJK, *Christologie*, pp. 79–80; BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 138, 318 (though he notes that the Christological use of the title "Lord" occurs in *Hermas* "äußerst selten", p. 419); and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, e.g., p. 56 with n. 14.

69 See *Vis.* 2,2,8: ὡμοσεν γὰρ κύριος κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, τοὺς ἀρνησαμένους τὸν κύριον αὐτῶν ἀπεγνωρίσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς ζωῆς αὐτῶν.

70 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 56.

is twofold. First, in early Christianity Jesus Christ was “the testing ground for Christians under persecution”.⁷¹ Second, the manuscript tradition understood the second part of the sentence as a reference to Jesus: S^c A L² and E read κύριον, S reads χριστόν and L¹ *filium* (*lacuna* in Bo).⁷² Osiek concludes: “Without question, the ms. tradition, whatever term is used, understands this as a reference to Jesus”.⁷³ But these arguments come across as an oversimplification of the text’s ambivalence. In *Hermas* both God and the Son are presented as “testing ground” for believers under persecution. In *Sim.* 9,28,3, for instance, suffering for the name (ἐπαθον διὰ τὸ ὄνομα)⁷⁴ is interpreted as suffering for the name of the Son of God (ἐπαθον διὰ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ), but in v. 6 suffering for the name of the Lord (πεπόνθατε ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματος κυρίου)⁷⁵ means suffering for God (διὰ τὸν θεὸν πάθῃ).⁷⁶ Moreover, it goes too far to say that “the manuscript tradition” understands the second part of *Vis.* 2,2,8 as referring to Jesus: S and L¹ do, but S^c A L² and E have the ambiguous reading κύριον.

A similar case is *Vis.* 3,6,5–6 (on rich believers): “when tribulation comes . . . they deny their Lord” (v. 5) and when they do not change “they cannot be useful to the Lord” (v. 6).⁷⁷ Dibelius and Osiek think that κύριος refers in v. 5 to Christ and in v. 6 to God.⁷⁸ Unfortunately, they do not provide any arguments for their position. In v. 6 κύριος does probably refer to God, because here “useful to the Lord” stands on one line with “useful to God” (εὐχρηστοὶ . . . τῷ

71 *Ibid.* (with refs.).

72 κύριον is accepted by WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN.

73 OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 56.

74 Reading of A; *ad. domini* L¹ L², *ad. eius* E. The shortest reading (A) is accepted by WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN (note that Ehrman’s footnotes 238–239 on pp. 452–453 are in the wrong place).

75 κυρίου is attested in Greek (A), but not in L¹ and L². It is accepted by WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN.

76 Reading of A and E; *om.* διὰ τὸν θεὸν L¹ and L². The former is accepted by WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN.

77 *Vis.* 3,6,5–6: ὅταν δὲ γένηται θλίψις . . . ἀπαρνούνται τὸν κύριον αὐτῶν (v. 5); οὐ δύνανται τῷ κυρίῳ εὐχρηστοὶ γενέσθαι (v. 6). In v. 5 only L² reads “God” instead of “Lord”, but this reading is probably secondary because S Bo and A, which form a strong combination, all read κύριον. κύριον is accepted by WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN. In v. 6 S L¹ L² and E read κυρίῳ, Bo reads θεῷ and A χριστῷ. “Christ” (A) is probably secondary, because if this was indeed the original reading, it is hard to see why it would later on have been changed. “God” (Bo) is most likely secondary as well: Bo, who reads it here and earlier on in this verse, appears to have smoothened out a difference. For a similar conclusion, see OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 73 n. 38, referring to CARLINI, *Papyrus Bodmer*, p. 89. κυρίῳ is accepted by WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN.

78 DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 469; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 73 n. 38.

θεῶ). Concerning v. 5, it is difficult to decide whether God or the Son is meant. Here and in several other passages it remains uncertain to whom κύριος refers.⁷⁹ The ambivalent use of κύριος may be a strategy of the Christian author.

Despite all this ambivalence, κύριος refers in some passages clearly to either God or the Son. In *Sim.* 9,23,4, for instance, God is meant: ὁ θεὸς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν. And in *Sim.* 5,6,4 the Son: αὐτός κύριος refers back to αὐτός in v. 3. In v. 3 αὐτός must be the Son, because it refers back to ὁ υἱός in v. 2 and because αὐτός in v. 3 is the one who received the law from the Father.⁸⁰ In *Vis.* 3,7,3, “to be baptized in the name of the Lord (βαπτισθῆναι εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου), the name intended may be that of the Son. The idea that “no one can enter into the kingdom of God except through the name of his beloved Son (διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἡγαπημένου ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ)” (*Sim.* 9,12,5) and that one “carries the name of the Son of God” (τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ φορῇ, 9,13,3) indicates that in *Vis.* 3,7,3 the name of the Son is meant.⁸¹ God’s Son is indeed Lord.⁸² He is the lord of the church (the tower) and the one in whose name believers are baptized.

We may conclude that Hermas ascribes to the Son of God (the historical Jesus)⁸³ an authority and identity which differ from traditional Jewish characterizations of eschatological agents. Hermas does not use traditional Jewish terms like Messiah, or Son of David. Moreover, the triad Father, Son and Spirit

79 See, e.g., *Vis.* 3,6,5; *Sim.* 8,6,3–4; 9,26,3–4.6; and 9,28,4.

80 The textual evidence for αὐτός κύριος is very limited. M reads βλέπεις οὖν, φησὶν, ὅτι αὐτὸς κύριος . . . (lacuna). On the basis of L¹ and L², GEBHARDT – HARNACK, *Hermas Pastor*, p. 154, conjecture that the reading was βλέπεις, φησὶν, ὅτι αὐτὸς κύριός ἐστι τοῦ λαοῦ, ἐξουσίαν πᾶσαν λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ. In this reading it is clear that κύριος refers to the Son. But βλέπεις οὖν . . . πατρὸς αὐτοῦ is missing in A and E. The latter can be explained on the basis of *homoioteleuton*, because in A v. 3 ends with the words παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ. Most likely, αὐτὸς κύριος (v. 4) is original. It is accepted by WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN.

81 See also, e.g., BROX, *Hirt*, p. 138; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 74 n. 49. Pace AUDET, *Affinités* (1953), p. 51. In several other passages “the name” may also refer to God’s Son. The use of “the name” is ambivalent in *Vis.* 3,1,9; 3,2,1; 3,5,2 (suffering for the name of the Lord); and *Sim.* 9,28,7. In *Vis.* 3,4,3; 3,3,5; and *Sim.* 9,28,6 it refers to God. In *Sim.* 9,13,2 and 9,28,3 to the Son.

82 Cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 486 with n. 6, who (following NIJENDIJK, *Christologie*, pp. 79–80) thinks that in *Hermas* κύριος refers to the Son of God in about a dozen of the ca. 340 occurrences: *Vis.* 3,5,2; 3,7,3; *Sim.* 5,6,4 (cf. 5,6,1); 8,1,1; 8,6,4; 9,5,2; 9,7,1; 9,10,4; 9,14,3; 9,28,2.6; and 9,30,2.

83 According to BROX, *Hirt*, p. 471, *Sim.* 5,6,2 and 9,12,3 are the only historical references to Christ in the document. See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 234. But see esp. *Sim.* 5,6,5, with σὰρξ referring to the Son as human, and v. 6: “on earth” (ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς).

is not connected with any Jewish origins.⁸⁴ God's Son is both lawgiver and God's law given to the world:⁸⁵ as personification of God's law, the Son exceeds the authority of any other law and, thus, also of the Jewish law (if this law is indeed envisioned). God's Son is the foundation of the cosmos and of the church.⁸⁶ Believers are saved through the Son of God.⁸⁷ And God's Son is Lord of the church and the one in whose name believers are baptized.⁸⁸

2.1.2 Polemics

Another question is whether Hermas affirms or rejects certain Christological positions, and, if so, whether any Jewish-Christian controversy is involved.⁸⁹ There is one passage which may reflect a Christological issue. In *Sim.* 5,5,2 it is explained that "the slave" of the parable of the vineyard "is the Son of God".⁹⁰ Other passages, by contrast, stress the lordship and exaltation of the Son.⁹¹ In *Sim.* 5,5,5 Hermas asks the Shepherd why the Son of God is in the parable presented as a slave. The manuscripts disagree whether the question is answered affirmatively or negatively: "the Son of God is (not) presented as a slave, yet with great power and domination".⁹² The negative is the *lectio difficilior*. It denies what seems obvious, because the slave of the parable has just been identified as the Son of God (*Sim.* 5,5,2).⁹³ Another argument in favour of the negative is that it fits well with v. 4a, which forms the conclusion of the pericope (*Sim.* 5,5,5–5,6,4a). The pericope starts with Hermas' question to the Shepherd why the Son of God appears in the parable as a slave (5,5,5) and ends

84 See *Sim.* 5,5,2.

85 See, resp., *Sim.* 5,6,3 and 8,3,2.

86 See *Sim.* 9,2,1; 9,3,1; 9,12,1–8; and 9,14,5–6.

87 See *Sim.* 8,11,1–5; 9,4,6–8; and 9,12,3–8.

88 See *Sim.* 5,6,4; 9,5,2.6; 9,6; 9,7,1; and 9,12,8; resp. *Sim.* 9,12,4–5 and 9,13,3.

89 The use of the term "Christological" may be seen as problematic in relation to a writing which does not refer to Christ at all, but there is no good alternative and in *Hermas* "Son of God" does, most likely, refer to Jesus Christ anyway.

90 *Sim.* 5,5,2: ὁ δὲ δοῦλος ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν.

91 For the lordship of the Son, see esp. *Sim.* 5,6,4 (see above). For the exaltation, see esp. *Sim.* 5,6,7 (see also Chapter 2).

92 See *Sim.* 5,6,1: εἰς δούλου τρόπον οὐ κεῖται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' εἰς ἐξουσίαν μεγάλην κεῖται καὶ κυριότητα. ° *txt* L¹ L² and E, *om.* A, *lacuna in* M. οὐ is accepted by WHITTAKER (brackets); JOLY; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN, but not by AUDET, *Affinités* (1953), p. 71, who paraphrases the verse as follows: "Le Fils de Dieu se présente sous la figure d'un esclave, (il est vrai), mais (aussi) en grande puissance et domination".

93 See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 178: the negative "forms such a problem that it is unlikely to have been inserted later".

with the Shepherd's remark "so, you see that he is Lord . . ." (5,6,4a).⁹⁴ In the concluding remark (5,6,4a) it is stated that the Son is Lord (αὐτὸς κύριος) and a man with power (ἐξουσίαν), received from his Father. Here κύριος and ἐξουσίαν refer back to κυριότητα, respectively ἐξουσίαν in 5,6,1. The problem of the denial in its direct context (5,5,2; 5,5,5; and 5,6,1) in combination with the logic of the argument which is developed later (5,6,4) justify the conclusion that οὐ needs to be accepted. Hermas rejects a Servant Christology.

Wilson suggests that Hermas introduces a Servant Christology in order to refute it.⁹⁵ Osiek rejects this suggestion, arguing that a Servant Christology is implied in vv. 2, 4 and 6 and that it is not criticized by Hermas:⁹⁶ it is not rejected altogether, but only "a total emphasis" on the identification of the Son with the slave.⁹⁷ Osiek adds: "The slave has had *complete charge* of the vineyard, but only *in obedience*, and this obedience results in his freedom, constituted by adoption as joint heir and companion with the son, the Holy Spirit".⁹⁸ The slave-Son identification would clarify the Son's authority in service of his Father. But the Shepherd's denial that the Son is to be regarded as a slave indicates that the author does, in fact, argue against a Servant Christology (or a humiliation-exaltation Christology). Wilson's suggestion is certainly worth consideration.

Why would the author reject a Servant Christology? According to Leutzsch, the reason may be a general aversion to slavery, perhaps stemming from the author's personal background.⁹⁹ Yet, there may be another explanation. Perhaps the author deliberately plays down a Servant Christology in favour of a Son of God Christology: Jesus may have been a servant who served God beyond normal expectations, but he is to be regarded as God's adopted Son.¹⁰⁰ This may explain also why the author never refers to "Jesus" or "Christ", but only to the "Son (of God)". Wilson suggests that the reason why Hermas does not

94 In the passage that follows (vv. 4b onwards), another aspect of the parable is explained, namely how the lord of the vineyard made the decision about the inheritance of the slave in the presence of his son (i.e., the Holy Spirit) and his advisors (vv. 4b–8).

95 See WILSON, *Reassessment*, p. 125.

96 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 178 with n. 25.

97 *Ibid.*, p. 178.

98 *Ibid.* (italics mine), following L. PERNVEDEN, *The Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas* (STL, 27), Lund, Gleerup, 1966, p. 46.

99 See LEUTZSCH, *Wahrnehmung*, p. 153.

100 Cf. B.G. BUCUR, *The Son of God and the Angelomorphic Holy Spirit: A Rereading of the Shepherd's Christology*, in ZNW 98 (2007) 120–142, p. 132, who argues that in *Hermas* a Servant Christology and a Spirit Christology (with the Son of God as the supreme "holy spirit") coexist.

use the name Jesus or the title Christ may be reverential.¹⁰¹ But perhaps there is something to be said for the idea that Hermas uses “Son of God” instead of “Jesus” or “Christ” because for him “Son of God” is the most honourable way to refer to Jesus Christ. If this is true, Hermas uses “Son of God” not out of reverential avoidance, but, on the contrary, out of reverence. He calls Jesus the Son of God and refutes a Servant Christology because he wishes to emphasize that Jesus is God’s adopted and exalted Son.

Sim. 5,5–6 appears to be the only passage in which Hermas deals with a Christological issue. Christology is not the author’s main interest. His focus is on community building. In *Hermas* polemics on the authority and identity of the Son of God are nearly absent. *Sim.* 5,5–6 involves an internal polemic; it does not seem to aim at outsiders. This indicates that *Hermas* was not written in a context of Jewish-Christian debates about the authority and identity of Jesus, but in a context in which “a thoroughly positive assessment of the figure of Jesus” as Son of God was beyond all doubt.¹⁰²

2.2 “Christianized” “Jewish” Motifs

Hermas’ use of Christianized Jewish motifs has been a matter of dispute. Lluís-Font contends that Hermas considers Christian themes in a Jewish way.¹⁰³ Hvalvik, however, concludes that *Hermas* shows no awareness of the Jewish heritage of the church at all.¹⁰⁴ Other commentators take a middle position by arguing that *Hermas* shows some awareness of the Jewish roots of the church, but does not so much emphasize the biblical or Jewish background as the fact that the church has moved on.¹⁰⁵

In *Sim.* 9,15,4 the foundation of the tower (the church) includes stones that represent the first two biblical generations and the prophets.¹⁰⁶ As such, the foundation of the church is indeed connected with the history of Israel. Brox

101 WILSON, *Five Problems*, pp. 73–79, argues this on the basis of esp. *Sim.* 9,14,5 (p. 76: “*Sim.* IX:14:5 clearly states the divinity and the power of the Son of God and implies the equality of the Son of God with God”) in relation to Jewish custom (p. 77: “The name of Jesus Christ takes on similar holy significance for the early Christians that the name of God . . . has for Jews”, see, e.g. Phil 2,9–10).

102 For the citation, see TUCKETT, *Matthew*, p. 103, who (carefully: see his n. 10) takes this as a “minimalist” position to define what “Christian” means.

103 See LLUIS-FONT, *Sources*, p. 97: “Hermas pense en juif les dogmes chrétiens”.

104 See HVALVIK, *Jewish Believers*, p. 215: “there is nothing that indicates a consciousness of the Jewish roots of the church”.

105 See, e.g., OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 244: “The church is founded on its biblical and Jewish heritage, but has moved on further”.

106 *Sim.* 9,15,4: πρώτη γενεά . . . δευτέρα γενεά ἀνδρῶν δικαίων . . . προφήται.

thinks the parable of the tower to have a Jewish origin (with the tower representing Israel).¹⁰⁷ What should be stressed, however, is that the parable as it stands, is clearly Christian. The other foundation stones represent apostles and teachers of the message of the Son of God.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, the four groups of foundation stones are only layers of the real fundament, namely the rock, which is the Son of God.¹⁰⁹ It is not the biblical prehistory of the church that is stressed, but the fact that both the pre-Christian and Christian generations have the Son of God as their fundamental basis.

One of the most apparent Christian adaptations is found in *Sim.* 9,17,1–2. Here it is explained that the twelve mountains stand for the twelve “tribes” (φύλαι) which inhabit the whole world and to whom the Son of God was preached by the apostles. Of course, φύλαι has Jewish connotations. Some commentators take it for granted that the Jewish background is a point of interest for Hermas. Osiek, for instance, comments that for Hermas the church is composed of twelve tribes which are “not . . . only from Israel”, but from the whole world.¹¹⁰ But it is, again, the Christian element that should be stressed. The twelve tribes

107 See BROX, *Hirt*, p. 377 (with refs.): “Es ist sicher richtig, diese Parabel [*Sim.* 9] für ursprünglich jüdisch zu halten . . . Der Turm war die ideale Gemeinde Israels . . . Diese Parabel ist im P[astor]H[ermae] recht frei wiederverwendet und natürlich christlich variiert”. Cf. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 220 n. 2, who criticizes Brox’ suggestion: “But if this is so, it is curious that the biblical basis is not present in the first tower, which would presumably be closer to the source”. Osiek’s argument is not convincing. Against Brox it should be stressed that it remains unknown whether Hermas Christianized the material himself, or used material that was already Christianized.

108 See *Sim.* 9,15,4: ἀπόστολοι καὶ διδάσκαλοι τοῦ κηρύγματος τοῦ υἱοῦ θεοῦ.

109 See *Sim.* 9,4,2–3. With T. ZAHN, *Antwort auf des Herrn Professor Dr. Lipsius Beleuchtung der Polemik eines Apologeten*, in *JDT* 15 (1870) 192–206, p. 195. See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 377: “Der Turm war die ideale Gemeinde Israels, erbaut auf dem Grund der Patriarchen, Gerechten, Propheten und Diener Gottes, gebildet aus den Frommen der zwölf Stämme Israels und der Heidenvölker”; and p. 430: “die Gruppen bilden zusammen das Fundament von vier Lagen über dem (eigentlichen) Fundament, das der Fels ist . . . Biblisch-alttestamentliche und kirchliche Größen sind—auf dem Felsen Christus—das Fundament des Turmes der Kirche”, to which he adds: “ohne daß . . . Israel ein Thema für ihn [Hermas] würde”. Brox’s comments may seem somewhat confusing, but are reconcilable: originally, the tower was the ideal community of Israel. Hermas uses a Christianized version of this motif. In *Hermas* biblical and Christian generations form layers of the real fundament, the rock, which is Jesus Christ.

110 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 24: “Some of the foundation stones of the tower in the ninth *Similitude* are the biblical founders and prophets (9.15.4), and the church is composed of twelve tribes (9.17.1–4) who are not, however, only from Israel but from the entire world”. See also SNYDER, *Shepherd*, pp. 13–14.

are not considered to be components of Israel, but twelve “peoples” (ἔθνη) which inhabit the world. Dibelius argues that Hermas Christianized Jewish material.¹¹¹ Verweij takes this as an “unnecessary detour” and suggests that the (Christianized) image of God’s people was already part of the Christian tradition.¹¹² Klevinghaus thinks that Hermas was unfamiliar with the idea of God’s Jewish people.¹¹³ It is difficult to decide whether Hermas Christianized Jewish material, or borrowed Christianized Jewish motifs from other sources. In any case, the continuity between Israel and the church is not of personal interest to Hermas. According to *Sim.* 9,30,3, believers and potential believers are all of the same kind (γένος). The idea that (Christian) believers form a γένος has been interpreted as “an alternative to the Jew-Gentile tension”.¹¹⁴ Hermas uses a “universal” collective term.

In *Hermas* there is more Christianized material.¹¹⁵ For example, there is the idea that the world was created for the church: “God . . . created what is from what is not . . . for the sake of his holy church”,¹¹⁶ “the church . . . was created first of all . . . and for her the world was created”.¹¹⁷ It has been argued that this involves a Christian adaptation of the Jewish idea that the world was created

111 See DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 604–605. Cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 441: “Bei H[ermas] wird aus dem Gottesvolk der zwölf Stämme . . . umgehend die Menschheit ‘auf der ganzen Welt’, und zwar unter dem Aspekt der christlichen Weltmission”.

112 See P.G. VERWEIJ, *Evangelium und neues Gesetz in der ältesten Christenheit bis auf Marcion* (STRT, 5), Utrecht, Kemink, 1960, p. 213 n. 35: “Dieser Umweg ist nicht nötig. Der christianisierte Gottesvolkgedanke lag schon in der christlichen Tradition vor”.

113 See J. KLEVINGHAUS, *Die theologische Stellung der Apostolischen Väter zur alttestamentlichen Offenbarung* (BFChTh, 44), Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1948, p. 123: “Das jüdische Volk ist für H[ermas] einfach nicht vorhanden”.

114 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 254 n. 3.

115 Three examples have been selected. Apart from these three, commentators mention several others. See, e.g., H. BRANDENBURG, *Studien zur Mitra. Beiträge zur Waffen- und Trachtgeschichte der Antike* (FC, 4), Münster, Aschendorff, 1966, p. 57 with n. 17, who argues that the headband of the woman church in *Vis.* 4,2,1 hints at the headdress of the Jerusalem high priest. But this may go too far. See, e.g., BROX, *Hirt*, p. 172. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 448; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 56, regard the oath taken by God on the Son in *Vis.* 2,2,8 as a Christian adaptation of a Jewish motif. But see the Greek and Roman parallels for taking an oath on one’s child(ren) in LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 399 n. 187.

116 See *Vis.* 1,1,6: ὁ θεὸς . . . κτίσας ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος τὰ ὄντα . . . ἔνεκεν τῆς ἁγίας ἐκκλησίας αὐτοῦ.

117 See *Vis.* 2,4,1: ἡ ἐκκλησία . . . πάντων πρώτη ἐκτίσθη . . . καὶ διὰ ταύτην ὁ κόσμος κατηρτίσθη. It should be noted that according to *Vis.* 1,3,4 the church was not created first, but after God had created the world, surrounded it with beauty, established the heaven and founded the earth upon the waters.

for Israel.¹¹⁸ Moreover, the personification of the church as a woman would build on the personification and feminization of Israel and Jerusalem in biblical literature.¹¹⁹ Finally, the heavenly “altar” (θυσιαστήριον) in *Man.* 10,3,2–3 would be a Christian adaptation of the “altar” of Jerusalem (θυσιαστήριον, LXX).¹²⁰ These three motifs, however, are attested in contemporary Christian literature.¹²¹ There is no evidence for any literary dependence, but the examples show that it cannot be ascertained that Hermas himself Christianized Jewish material.

For Hermas it is not so much the Jewish heritage as the current situation of the church that matters.¹²² Hermas’ primary means of expressing the collective identity of the church indicates that he regards it as a community in its own right. In the literature on “identity” three means of expressing one’s distinctiveness are distinguished: “story”, “ethos” and “ritus”.¹²³ In *Hermas* it is not the story of Jesus, but the ethos of the community and the praxis of community building which are most prominent. Hermas’ focus on the improvement and formation of the church (μετάνοια), rather than, for instance, on defending or rejecting certain Christological positions, forms a strong indication that the author regards the ἐκκλησία as an entity which goes its own way.

118 See DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 433; LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 381 n. 36 (with refs.); and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 44.58 n. 5.

119 See, e.g., OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 58 n. 6.68 (with refs.).

120 See HILHORST, *Sémitismes*, p. 159–160 with n. 3; BROX, *Hirt*, p. 247; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 138 n. 20 (with refs.).

121 For the first, see, e.g., 2 *Clem.* 14,1 (LINDEMANN, *Clemensbriefe*, p. 240: “[die Kirche wird] als ... präexistent ... bezeichnet ... zum Gedanken der Präexistenz der Kirche vgl. Herm Vis II 4,1”). For the second, 2 John 1 (M.J.J. MENKEN, 1, 2 en 3 *Johannes. Een praktische bijbelverklaring* [Tekst en toelichting], Kampen, Kok, 2010, p. 119, explains the image from Old and New Testament parallels). For the third, Rev 8,3 (D.E. AUNE, *Revelation 6–16* [WBC, 52b], Nashville, TN, Nelson, 1998, p. 511, interprets the θυσιαστήριον as “the heavenly counterpart to the Israelite ‘altar of incense’”).

122 See also, e.g., KLEVINGHAUS, *Die theologische Stellung*, p. 123 (see above); L. GOPPELT, *Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert. Ein Aufriß der Urgeschichte der Kirche* (BFChTh, 55), Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1954, p. 243: “Die Gemeinde löst ... Israel nicht mehr heilsgeschichtlich ab, sondern nimmt geradezu seine Stelle ein”; and VERWEIJS, *Evangelium*, pp. 212–214, esp. p. 213: “Hermas [steht] auf dem Boden der nach-apostolischen Vorstellung von Kirche und Gottesvolk. In dieser Zeit wird das Gottesvolk nicht mehr nach dem Bilde Israels verstanden ... Israel ist nicht die der christlichen vorausgehende Kirche; nach dem Evangelium gibt es nur ein Gottesvolk ... Das ist die Kirche”.

123 For these categories, see GARLEFF, *Urchristliche Identität*, pp. 26–47. See also VERHEYDEN, *Jewish Christianity*, p. 129.

2.3 *Away from the Jewish Law*

According to Tuckett, it is reasonable “to assign some kind of ‘Jewish’ identity to those who obeyed the Law; and equally to assign some kind of ‘Jewish Christian’ (or ‘Christian Jewish’) identity to those Christians who obeyed the Law”.¹²⁴ Using this as starting point, the term “Jewish Christian” can be used for believers in Jesus Christ who observed (aspects of) Torah.¹²⁵ A problem of this definition is that it turns more or less every Christian into a Jewish Christian, for “no Christian writer (with the possible exception of Marcion) ever ignored or rejected the Jewish Law in toto”.¹²⁶ It is, therefore, necessary to establish which parts of the Jewish law are significant for defining Jewish identity. Three elements of the Jewish law appear to be particularly significant: Kashrut, Sabbath observance and circumcision.¹²⁷ Hermas does not address any of these issues, but this silence is open to more than one interpretation. What follows will investigate whether in *Hermas* the Jewish law plays any role of importance.

2.3.1 Νόμος

A first issue is the meaning of νόμος. A key passage is *Sim.* 5,6,3, where it is stated that the Son has given the people “the law” (τὸν νόμον) which he received from his Father. It is contested what νόμος means here. Skarsaune, for instance, comments that the verse “directly identifies God’s Son with the Torah”.¹²⁸ Osiek takes νόμος as “the new law of Christ . . . in continuity with Torah”.¹²⁹ Brox thinks that the Christian principle of life, the Christian orientation, or the preaching

¹²⁴ See TUCKETT, *Matthew*, p. 106.

¹²⁵ See also VERHEYDEN, *Jewish Christianity*, p. 127; and S.C. MIMOUNI, *Pour une définition nouvelle du judéo-christianisme ancien*, in *NTS* 38 (1992) 161–186, p. 184; rev. in ID., *Le judéo-christianisme*, p. 70: “Le judéo-christianisme ancien est une formulation récente désignant des juifs qui ont reconnu la messianité de Jésus, qui ont reconnu ou n’ont pas reconnu la divinité du Christ, mais qui tous continuent à observer Torah”.

¹²⁶ See TUCKETT, *Matthew*, p. 106. For Marcion’s rejection of the Jewish Scriptures, see, e.g., P. FOSTER, *Marcion: His Life, Works, Beliefs, and Impact*, in *ET* 121(6) (2010) 269–280, p. 279, who concludes: “In a brilliant and daring master-stroke Marcion jettisoned any connection with the Old Testament”.

¹²⁷ See, e.g., J.D.G. DUNN, *The Parting of the Ways between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity*, London, SCM; Philadelphia, PA, Trinity, 1991, pp. 28–31; and TUCKETT, *Matthew*, p. 107.

¹²⁸ See O. SKARSAUNE, *Jewish Christian Sources Used by Justin Martyr and Some Other Greek and Latin Fathers*, in SKARSAUNE – HVALVIK, *Jewish Believers in Jesus*, pp. 379–416, p. 403.

¹²⁹ See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 179.

of the Son of God is meant.¹³⁰ Hasler interprets it as the gospel.¹³¹ Overall, there is no sufficient evidence that in *Hermas* νόμος, νόμιμος, or ἐντολή would refer to the Jewish law.¹³²

130 See BROX, *Hirt*, p. 362: "Der Sohn Gottes... ist das Gesetz als das Lebensprinzip der Christen". Cf. p. 365 (on *Sim.* 8,3,3): "das Gesetz... die lebensstiftende Orientierung... oder genereller 'die Predigt des Sohnes Gottes' [= GEBHARDT – HARNACK, *Hermes Pastor*, p. 179]... 'the Christian rule of life' [= K. LAKE, *The Apostolic Fathers. II. The Shepherd of Hermas, The Martyrdom of Polycarp, The Epistle to Diognetus* [LCL], Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1948⁶, p. 199 n. 1; and SNYDER, *Shepherd*, p. 119]". See also p. 490: "Der Sohn Gottes ist also mehr als Gesetzgeber, nämlich das Gesetz selbst, also die Handlungsnorm in Form seines beispielhaften Lebens". In other parts of his commentary, Brox's position is less clear. See esp. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 362 (where Brox argues against SCHWEITZER, *Pastor Hermas*, p. 545): "Auf keinen Fall will H[ermas] die Anforderungen an den Christen auf das alttestamentliche Gesetz reduziert haben". See also p. 434 (against KLEIVINGHAUS, *Die theologische Stellung*, pp. 121.123): "Daraus zu schließen, der P[astor] H[ermas] wolle kein anderes Gesetz erfüllen als das des AT und nehme eine vollständige 'Inanspruchnahme des AT als des die Kirche konstituierenden, Leben schaffenden Gesetzes vor' (Klevinghaus, 121.123), ist ein kompletter Irrtum". The wording leaves open two possible interpretations: in *Hermas* the law is not, or not only the law of the Old Testament.

131 See V.E. HASLER, *Gesetz und Evangelium in der alten Kirche bis Origenes. Eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, Zürich – Frankfurt am Main, Gotthelf, 1953, p. 31: "Das Evangelium ist als Gesetz gefasst". See also VERWEIJS, *Evangelium*, p. 206; and S. SCHULZ, *Die Mitte der Schrift. Der Frühkatholizismus im Neuen Testament als Herausforderung an den Protestantismus*, Stuttgart – Berlin, Kreuz, 1976, p. 357: "Von Hermas wird das Evangelium als Gesetz verstanden, wie umgekehrt das Gesetz als Evangelium verkündigt wird".

132 For νόμιμος, see *Vis.* 1,3,4 (τὰ νόμιμα). There is no evidence that the Jewish laws are meant. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 441, states "νόμιμα vgl. LXX", which suggests that Hermas uses the term in the sense of the laws of the Scriptures. But BROX, *Hirt*, p. 92, comments: "Gott [bindet] seine Zusage an die Gebotserfüllung, also an ein christliches Leben, an die Bewährung der Christen", which suggests that νόμιμα has a Christian meaning.

For νόμος (which occurs only in the *Similitudes*), see, e.g., *Sim.* 1,3–6, on local (Roman) laws vs. believers' own (heavenly) law. See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 287: "eigene[s] (= christliche[s]) Gesetz". See further *Sim.* 5,6,3, the law the Son received from his Father; and 8,3, e.g. v. 2: "God's law given to the whole world"; "this law is the Son of God, preached (κηρυχθεῖς) until the ends of the earth". ZAHN, *Hirt*, pp. 151–152, concludes on the basis of this passage that νόμος means in *Hermas* by definition the law of Christ. But it cannot be assumed that Hermas always uses the word in the same way.

For ἐντολή in the sense of *Mandate(s)*, see *Vis.* 5,5–6; the superscriptions of *Man.* 1–12; *Man.* 1,2; 2,7; 4,2,4; 4,4,4; 5,2,8; 6,1,1; 6,2,10; 12,3,2.4.6; 12,4,3–5; 12,6,4; *Sim.* 5,3,3; 6,1,1–4; 7,6–7; 8,6,6; 8,7,5; 8,8,2; 8,11,3–4; 9,1,1; 9,23,2; 9,33,3; 10,1,2–3 (*mandata*); 10,2,4 (*mandata*); 10,3,1 (*mandata*); 10,3,4 (τὰς ἐντολὰς ταύτας); and 10,4,1 (*mandata*). Cf. *Sim.* 5,2,1.4.7, where ἐντολή

2.3.2 Hermas' Silence as to the Jewish Law: The Example of Circumcision

Is for Hermas the Jewish law perhaps a matter of course (which does not need to be mentioned), a stumbling block (which is deliberately not mentioned), or not at all a matter of interest? There are some indications that the third option is best. Hermas does not contend with or reject the Jewish law. Furthermore, Hermas presupposes an entry rite to become a member of the community, and this rite is baptism;¹³³ in this regard, circumcision is not mentioned and, most likely, not implied.

is used in the sense of "task". For the meaning of God's/the Lord's commandments, see *Vis.* 3,5,3; *Man.* 3,2,5; 7,1,4–5; 8,12; 12,4,3–6; 12,5,5; *Sim.* 1,8; 5,1,5; 5,3,2–4; 5,5,3; 6,2,2; 8,3,8; 8,7,5–6; 9,14,6; and 9,29,2.

Cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 514 (on *Sim.* 8,3,2): "Als Summe der Gebote ist das Gesetz der Sohn Gottes". Pace OSIEK, *Shepherd*, esp. pp. 152 (on *Man.* 12,3,4), 193 n. 22 (on *Sim.* 7,5–7) and 208 (on *Sim.* 8,7,6). *Man.* 12,3,4—the Shepherd's commandments (αἱ ἐντολαί) are said to be "capable to gladden the heart of the person who can keep them" (δυνάμεναι εὐφρᾶναι καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου τοῦ δυναμένου τηρῆσαι αὐτάς). Osiek (p. 152 with n. 6) points at Ps 18,9 LXX, where "The reference to 'gladdening the human heart' is applied to the Law", and she argues that "the allusion here suggests a relationship between the two realms of commandments". But the agreement in wording is not that striking: Ps 18,9 LXX (ed. RAHLFS) reads τὰ δικαιώματα κυρίου εὐθεΐα, εὐφραίνοντα καρδίαν. The background of the phrase in *Hermas* may well be the general theme of joyfulness, which plays an important role in the text. And even if Hermas would allude to some passages on the law in the Scriptures (e.g. Deut), it still stands that he only speaks of the Shepherd's (twelve) commandments and does not connect them with the Jewish law.

Sim. 7,6–7—μετάνοια (v. 6) for Hermas, his children, his household and for all means keeping the commandments as communicated by the Shepherd (ταῖς ἐντολαῖς μου, vv. 6–7). Osiek (p. 193 n. 22) thinks that keeping the commandments is meant "in the true spirit of Jewish law observance", because in the Hebrew Scriptures there is "a close connection among fidelity to the covenant, keeping the law, humbling oneself in conversion, and forgiveness of sins". But Hermas does not seem to envision any connection with the Jewish law.

Sim. 8,7,6—"the commandments of the Lord" (τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ κυρίου... ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς). Osiek (p. 208) argues that these "envision the Decalogue and related matter, but also everything communicated by the Shepherd". But there is nothing specific to suggest that the Decalogue is meant. In v. 5 ἐντολαί is used for the commandments communicated by the Shepherd. In v. 6 it is stated that in the Lord's commandments there is "nothing about prominent positions or honour, but about a man's long-suffering and humility" (v. 6). Why would this specifically refer to the Decalogue? See also, e.g., BROX, *Hirt*, p. 372: "Bei den Geboten ist an die schriftliche Form von Vis II 4,2,3 gedacht".

133 See, e.g., *Vis.* 3,3,5 and *Sim.* 9,16,3–4. See Chapter 7.

Hermas' silence on circumcision and, similarly, on Kashrut, Sabbath observance and other aspects of the Jewish law is probably not just a matter of coincidence. The reason why there is no evidence that Hermas expects believers to observe the Jewish law, or that there were community members who did keep these laws, is probably that Jewish law observance had no special significance for the author and his audience.¹³⁴

¹³⁴ A possible objection to the preceding analysis may be that it depends too much on Garleff's model. Therefore, it is important to note that *Hermas* does not conform to the models of (e.g.) Dunn, Casey, or Luomanen either.

DUNN, *Parting of the Ways*, distinguishes four "pillars" of Judaism: monotheism, election (a covenant people, a promised land), law (Torah) and temple. In *Hermas* only monotheism plays a role (see esp. *Man.* 1,1). Covenantal theology is not a theme (note that the term διαθήκη is not used). The land of Israel has no special meaning: the world in general and one's place of residence in particular are regarded as contingent (see esp. *Sim.* 1). Source of authority is not the Jewish law, but the law of God, revealed to the people through God's Son. Finally, the (destruction of the) Jerusalem temple does not seem to play any role. More than that, there is no explicit engagement with any Jewish institution. It has been argued that the setting of *Man.* 11,1, where (in Hermas' vision) people are sitting on a bench and one person is seated in a chair, is that of a synagogue or synagogue school (PETERSON, *Kritische Analyse*, pp. 283–284). But this interpretation is unconvincing, for the seating arrangement does not need to have any Jewish connotations. "Synagogue of just men" (συναγωγή ἀνδρῶν δικαίων, vv. 9.13–14) is a common term for the Christian assembly (see, e.g., OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 144 n. 37; pace M.D. NANOS, *The Jewish Context of the Gentile Audience Addressed in Paul's Letter to the Romans*, in *CBQ* 61 [1999] 283–304, p. 288).

P.M. CASEY, *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God: The Origins and Development of New Testament Christology. The Edward Cadbury Lectures at the University of Birmingham, 1985–1986*, Cambridge, Clarke; Louisville, KY, Westminster – John Knox, 1991, p. 12, discerns eight Jewish "identity factors": "ethnicity, scripture, monotheism, circumcision, sabbath observance, dietary laws, purity laws and major festivals". In *Hermas* most of these identity markers, apart from monotheism, do not play a role. For Hermas, the church incorporates "people" (ἔθνη) from all over the world (*Sim.* 9,17,1–2) and believers and potential believers are of the same "kind" (γένος, *Sim.* 9,30,3). Continuity with Jewish tradition or Scripture is not emphasized (besides, such a concern for continuity is not typically "Jewish" Christian). Circumcision, Sabbath observance, dietary laws, purity laws, or festivals are not mentioned. The idea that the willow tree of *Sim.* 8 evokes the *lulab* of Sukkoth is unfounded (pace FORD, *Liturgical Background*, pp. 535–537). Jewish rites or institutions are not mentioned (see also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 55 and HVALVIK, *Jewish Believers*, p. 215; cf. KLEVINGHAUS, *Die theologische Stellung*, p. 123). Of Dunn's four "pillars" and Casey's eight "identity markers", only monotheism plays a role in *Hermas*. But this does not make *Hermas* a "Jewish Christian" writing.

Finally, LUOMANEN, *Recovering Jewish-Christian Sects*, pp. 11–12, lists six indicators of Jewish Christianity by asking six questions. Concerning *Hermas* the answers to these

Concluding Remarks

There is no basis for designating *Hermas* as “Jewish Christian”. This is concluded on the basis of Garleff’s model, which distinguishes two criteria (continuity and separation) and three means of expressing one’s distinctive identity (story, ethos, and ritus).

Continuity between the biblical or Jewish traditions and the church is not stressed. *Hermas* does not identify himself or his community as of a Jewish (or pagan) background. It is not the Hebrew or Greek Scriptures, but the new documents of the church that matter (esp. *Vis.* 2,4,3). And it is not the Jewish background of the moral teachings that is emphasized, but the present situation of the church which needs to be changed by means of *μετάνοια*.

The present church is separated from the past. *Hermas* ascribes to the Son of God (the historical Jesus: esp. *Sim.* 5,6,2.5–7) an authority and identity that differ from traditional Jewish categories. *Hermas* does, for instance, not designate God’s Son as Messiah, Son of David, or as fulfilment of promises in the Scriptures. Moreover, the Son is the personification of God’s law given to the world (*Sim.* 8,3,2), which indicates that the Son is already exalted and exceeds the authority of any other law. Furthermore, the Son is the foundation of the cosmos and of the church (*Sim.* 9,14,4–6), lord of the church (*Sim.* 9,5,2.6; 9,6; 9,7,1; and 9,12,8) and the one in whose name believers are baptized (*Sim.* 9,12,4–5) and through whom they are saved (esp. *Sim.* 9,12,3–8). *Hermas* does not testify to any Jewish-Christian controversies on the figure of Jesus. A Servant Christology is rejected in order to emphasize that Jesus is God’s adopted and exalted Son (*Sim.* 5,6,1), but this is an internal polemic. Jewish-Christian discussions belong to bygone times. *Hermas* shows traces of “Christianized”

questions are as follows. “1. Are characteristically Jewish practices such as (Jewish) circumcision, the Sabbath and purity laws observed?” No. “2. Are characteristically Jewish ideas such as Yahweh as the only God, the temple as Yahweh’s abode, or the Torah, maintained?” No. “3. What is the pedigree of the group/person? Jewish or not?” *Hermas* does not identify himself or his community as either Jewish or Gentile. “4. What is the role of Jesus in the worship and ideology of the community? Is Jesus considered as a Jewish prophet or is he more a divine being, worshipped as *Kyrios* (“Lord”), an equal to God?” For *Hermas*, the Son of God is Lord (κύριος). God’s Son is not connected with the Scriptures. “5. Is baptism in the name of Jesus (or the triune God) an entrance rite to the community?” For *Hermas*, the entrance rite to the church is baptism in the name of the Son of God. “6. To what extent are these or other issues important for inter- or intra-group relations? What roles do they play in defining the borders and identity of the group in question?” “Jewish-Christian” identity markers are for *Hermas* no matter of interest. In sum, none of Luomanen’s “Jewish Christian” indicators apply to *Hermas*.

“Jewish” motifs (e.g., *Vis.* 1,1,6; *Man.* 10,3,2–3; and *Sim.* 9,17,1–2), but this material may well have been part of the Christian tradition already. The foundation of the church is connected with the history of Israel (*Sim.* 9,15,4), but it is not the biblical or Jewish prehistory that is stressed, but the fact that the church has moved on further (esp. *Sim.* 9,4,2–3 and 9,15,4). Finally, Hermas’ silence on Kashrut, Sabbath and circumcision indicates that Jewish law observance had for him or his community no special significance. There is no evidence that νόμος, or the related words νόμιμος, or ἐντολή would refer to the Jewish law.

It is not the story of Jesus, but the believers’ ethos and the praxis of community building that form the primary means of expressing the collective identity of the church. Hermas’ focus on the improvement and formation of the community indicates that the ἐκκλησία is considered to be an entity in its own right.

Jewish identity markers do not play any role of importance in *Hermas*. Hermas and his community were probably “just” *Christian*.

Resurrection Belief

One of the most debated theological issues regarding *Hermas* concerns its views on the resurrection.¹ This is part of the discussion on how *Hermas* fits in the context of divergent forms of Christian faith and practice at the time. *Hermas* is a Christian work even though the term “Christian”, the name “Jesus”, or the title “Christ” are absent in the text.² It has been argued that the work belongs to the Christian tradition, but not to “the current” tradition.³ Others reject this view and think that “our notions of the Christian tradition need to be widened”.⁴ The question is whether there was in the late first or early second century something like “mainstream Christianity”, or whether there were just several currents running in various directions.

All kinds of theories have been proposed. It has been contended that the church was at the time characterized by theological diversity and that the references in *Hermas* to “false, evil and would-be teachers”⁵ may reflect

1 An earlier version of this chapter was published as M. GRUNDEKEN, *Resurrection of the Dead in the Shepherd of Hermas: A Matter of Dispute*, in G. VAN OYEN – T. SHEPHERD (eds.), *Resurrection of the Dead: Biblical Traditions in Dialogue* (BETL, 249), Leuven, Peeters, 2012, pp. 403–416. I thank Peeters for permission to include the article here.

2 See Chapter 1.

3 See AUDET, *Affinités* (1953), p. 82: “Le Pasteur appartient à la tradition chrétienne, mais il n’est pas dans le courant”.

4 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 38. See also G. LA PIANA, *The Roman Church at the End of the Second Century*, in *HTR* 18 (1925) 201–277, p. 203: “the history of the church of Rome of the first three centuries has a unique importance . . . the Christian community at Rome was not only one of the largest, but also was highly representative of the various currents of thought, tradition, and practice of the whole Christian church”; C. OSIEK, *The Second Century through the Eyes of Hermas: Continuity and Change*, in *BTB* 20 (1990) 116–122, p. 117; and BUCUR, *Angelomorphic Holy Spirit*, p. 141: “the *Shepherd* was very much part of mainstream Christian thought in the first three centuries”.

5 See esp. *Vis.* 3,7,1; *Man.* 11,1; *Sim.* 5,7,2; 8,6,5; 9,19,2–3; and 9,22,1. *Vis.* 3,7,1—“those who have believed, but because of their doubt leave their true road” (οἱ πεπιστευκότες μὲν, ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς διψυχίας αὐτῶν ἀφίρουν τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτῶν τὴν ἀληθινὴν). Compare the interpretations of DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 470: “ein . . . neue[s] nichtchristliche[s] Heils-Mysterium . . .”; JOLY, *Hermas*, p. 117: a return to paganism, or joining some heretical movement; BROX, *Hirt*, p. 137: “verschiedene Formen philosophischer, kultischer, synkretistischer Frömmigkeit”; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 74 with n. 43: “some form of heterodox belief or worship may be envisioned”, but probably not Gnosticism, because the believers leave the community, whereas in *Hermas*

tensions caused by figures like Valentinus, Cerdo, Marcion and Marcellina, though for Hermas “these theological disagreements were not at the center of concern”.⁶ Hermas has been designated by some as a Montanist, yet by others as an anti-Montanist.⁷ He has been labelled an ascetic or

time Gnostics were unlikely to be completely separate (see also LEUTZSCH, *Wahrnehmung*, p. 75).

Man. 11,1—believers are in the company of a “false prophet” (ψευδοπροφήτης). DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 538–540, rejects the idea that the prophet is a pagan or Gnostic and interprets the passage in terms of a decline of prophecy in the early church. SNYDER, *Shepherd*, pp. 86–87, takes the false prophet as a heretic. BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 263–264, argues that the issue is “Synkretismus im Christentum des 2. Jh.s, unter dessen Einfluß pagane Mantik in die Kirche . . . eingeschleust wurde”. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 142, sees the false prophet as a Christian and interprets the setting of *Man.* 11,1 (following D.E. AUNE, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*, Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 1983, pp. 227, 413 n. 226) as “a gathering of clients of the Christian *mantis* for an oracular séance”.

Sim. 5,7,2—the Shepherd tells Hermas not to think that his “flesh” (σάρξ) is perishable. L. DUCHESNE, *Histoire ancienne de l’église*. I, Paris, Fontemoing, 1907, pp. 188–189, thinks that the passage polemicalizes against teachers like Marcion and Valentinus. Similarly, DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 574, 576, believes (with some reservations) that an anti-Gnostic polemic might be involved. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 326, rejects an anti-Gnostic, or anti-heretical reading; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 182, is sceptical too.

Sim. 8,6,5—“those who introduced other teachings (διδάχας ἑτέρας)”. Cf. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 596: “Das kann auf Gnostiker gehen”; BROX, *Hirt*, p. 370: “heretics” (whose exact heresies remain unknown); and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 207 with n. 65: “heterodox teachers” within the community.

Sim. 9,19,2–3—διδάσκαλοι πονηρίας: either “teachers of (i.e., who teach) evil” (*genitivus obiectivus*, see, e.g. JOLY, *Hermas*, p. 213), or “evil teachers” (*genetivus qualitatis*, see, e.g. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 628). Compare DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 628–629: “Die Irrlehrer rechnen sich selbst zu den Christen . . . man wird . . . mit Gnostikern zu tun haben”; BROX, *Hirt*, p. 445: “Ketzer”; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 245: “not . . . formal heresy . . . but some [i.e., Christians] who get carried away with their own ideas”.

Sim. 9,22,1—“those who want to know everything, but know nothing at all” (θέλοντες πάντα γινώσκειν καὶ οὐδὲν ὅλως γινώσκουσι). Compare DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 630: “Aus der offenbaren Anspielung mit γινώσκειν ist als sicher zu erschließen, daß es sich um Gnostiker handelt”; BROX, *Hirt*, p. 447, who rejects the idea that Gnostics are meant and interprets them as false Christian teachers; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 247, who argues that it may be “a bad caricature of Gnostics”, but that there is no sufficient evidence “to assume full-blown Gnosticism as the culprit”.

6 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 22.

7 For the former, see already, e.g., R.A. LIPSIVS, *Der Hirte des Hermas und der Montanismus in Rom*, in *ZWTh* 8 (1865) 266–308, esp. p. 308. For the latter, J.-B. COTELIER, *J.B. Cotelieri iudicium de S. Hermæ Pastore*, in ID. – J. LE CLERC, ss. *Patrum qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt, Barnabae, Clementis, Hermæ, Ignatii, Polycarpi* [etc.]. I, Antwerp, Huguetani, 1698, pp. 73–74,

enkratite.⁸ It has been suggested that Elchasai, to whom Hippolytus refers, “could possibly be the Shepherd”.⁹ All these theories, however, are highly problematic.

-
- p. 73: “So, happy are they who have kept a middle course . . . and who have taken *Pastor Hermas* as a treatise that, although not canonical, is yet ecclesiastical . . . and a defence of catholic faith against the hardness of Montanus” (*Medium itaque beati tenuere . . . quicumque Hermas Pastorem iudicavere σύνταγμα non quidem Canonicum, sed Ecclesiasticum . . . & propugnaculum fidei Catholicae adversus Montani durtiam* [with adaptations: spelling and italics]). Cf. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 422: “Vollends von Montanismus ist noch keine Rede”. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 267, sees the contradictory views on Hermas’ relation to Montanism as an indication that both options (Montanist, or anti-Montanist) are false: “Daß diese krass konträre Einschätzung möglich war, spricht für keine der beiden Thesen”.
- 8 For the former, see, e.g., J. AMSTUTZ, *Ἀπλότης Eine begriffsgeschichtliche Studie zum jüdisch-christlichen Griechisch* (Theoph., 19), Bonn, Hanstein, 1968, p. 134: “Hermas fungiert . . . als der Typus des büßenden Asketen”. For the latter, D. ΠΛΟΙΙ, *Eine enkratitische Glosse im Diatessaron. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Askese in der alten Kirche*, in *ZNW* 22 (1923) 1–16, p. 5: “die Ehe bei Hermas [ist] enkratitisch gestaltet”. The idea that Hermas was an ascetic or enkratite is based on the frequent use of ἐγκράτεια, ἐγκρατεύομαι and ἐγκρατής. See esp. *Vis.* 1.2.4: Ἐρμᾶς ὁ ἐγκρατής; and *Vis.* 2.3.2, ἡ πολλὴ ἐγκράτεια (of Hermas). But in *Hermas* these terms are not used in their (later) technical sense of, resp., “continence”, “to exercise sexual continence”, or “the continent”, but in the sense of “restraint”, “to keep oneself under control” and “the moderate one”. See also ΟΣΙΕΚ, *Shepherd*, esp. pp. 47, 56, 78, 104, 129. See further *Vis.* 3.8.4.7 and *Sim.* 9.15.2—one of the women, who represent virtues, is named ἐγκράτεια. *Man.* 1.2—the Shepherd exhorts Hermas: believe in God, fear God and ἐγκράτευσαι. *Man.* 6.1.1—the three elements of *Man.* 1.2 are repeated, with ἐγκράτειαν as the third one. *Man.* 8.1—ἡ ἐγκράτεια is “ambivalent” (διπλῇ), because there are things one should, and things one should not “abstain from” (ἐγκρατεύεσθαι). In v. 2 the Shepherd exhorts Hermas: “abstain from (ἐγκρατεύου) evil”, but “do not abstain from (μὴ ἐγκρατεύου) what is good”, for “when you abstain from (ἐγκρατεύσῃ) what is good”, you commit a sin, but “when you abstain from (ἐγκρατεύσῃ) what is evil”, you act righteously. “So, abstain from (ἐγκράτευσαι) every evil”. After the catalogues of vices, the Shepherd exhorts Hermas: “abstain from (ἐγκράτευσαι) all these things, so that . . . you will be inscribed with those who abstain from (τῶν ἐγκρατευσόμενων) these things”. For ἐγκρατεύεσθαι (in the sense of “to abstain from”), see vv. 2–3 (catalogue of vices), 4–5 (catalogue of vices), 6. See further v. 12 as well as *Sim.* 5.1.5 (ἐγκρατεύσῃ), where the term is used in a similar sense. For μὴ ἐγκρατεύεσθαι (in the sense of “not to abstain from”), see vv. 7–8 (catalogue of virtues). See further vv. 7.11 (μὴ ἐγκρατεύου), 8 (μὴ ἐγκρατεύῃται) and 12 (μὴ ἐγκρατεύσῃ), all with a similar meaning.
- 9 See HAHNEMAN, *Muratorian Fragment*, p. 38, referring to Hippolytus, *Haer.* 8.9. For Elchasai and the Elchasaites, see esp. G.P. LUTTIKHUIZEN, *The Revelation of Elchasai: Investigations into the Evidence for a Mesopotamian Jewish Apocalypse of the Second Century and Its Reception by Judeo-Christian Propagandists* (TSAJ, 8), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1985; and ID., *Elchasaites and their Book*, in A. MARJANEN – P. LUOMANEN (eds.), *A Companion to Second-Century Christian ‘Heretics’* (SVigChr, 76), Leiden, Brill, 2008, pp. 335–364.

One of the key criteria that has been used to situate *Hermas* in the world of early Christianity(-ies) is its consonance or dissonance with the canonical gospels or the Pauline writings.¹⁰ In the literature on the formation of the biblical canons, a similar criterion has been brought to the fore. In his article on the New Testament canon, De Jonge argues that agreement with the basic theological ideas accepted as normative by earlier Christian generations was an important and perhaps even decisive criterion in the formation of the canon.¹¹ In other words, there were currents running in different directions, but some were stronger than others. This chapter will not go further into this matter. It will focus on one of the “strong currents”: belief in the resurrection.¹²

Hermas does not use any resurrection terminology, not even when there is every reason to do so. A key passage is *Sim.* 5,6–7, which deals with the adoption and ascension of God’s Son and, more generally, with life beyond death. It will be argued that *Hermas* does not envision a resurrection, an angelic transformation, or an ascension of the soul to heaven, but a continued existence.

1 Resurrection, Angelic Afterlife, or Ascension of the Soul to Heaven?

1.1 Resurrection

A first position is that *Hermas* envisions resurrection. This position is primarily based on the parable of the vineyard in *Sim.* 5,2 and its interpretations in *Sim.* 5,6–7. In *Sim.* 5,2,1–8 it is narrated how an owner of a field with a vineyard chooses one of his slaves, who is trustworthy to him, to look after his vineyard and to surround it with a fence during his absence. He promises to release him if he keeps this command (v. 2). When the owner is gone, the slave decides to do more than what has been demanded: he does not only enclose the vineyard, but also digs it up and roots out the weeds (vv. 3–4). When the owner returns and sees the vineyard being enclosed and even dug and weeded, he is so well pleased with the work of his slave (v. 5) that he calls his son, who is his heir, and his friends, who are his advisors, and tells them what the slave has

10 See, e.g., BROX, *Hirt*, p. 189: “explizit Christliches enthalten die Mand . . . nur selten . . . oder gar nicht . . . jesuanische und paulinische Elemente spielen keine profilierende Rolle”.

11 See H.J. DE JONGE, *The New Testament Canon*, in AUWERS – DE JONGE (eds.), *The Biblical Canons*, pp. 309–319, pp. 318 and 319 with n. 32, who calls this criterion “the criterion of orthodoxy”.

12 Among others, E. LOHSE, *Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments* (ThW, 4), Stuttgart – Berlin – Köln, Kohlhammer, 2001⁶, pp. 19–21, believes that Jesus’ death and resurrection form the basis of early Christian proclamation.

done. When they hear the news, they congratulate the slave (v. 6). Besides the promised manumission, the owner rewards his slave by making him joint heir (συγκληρονόμος) with his son (v. 7), a decision with which the son is (surprisingly!) very happy (v. 8).

In *Sim.* 5,6,4–8 it is explained how the lord of the vineyard in the presence of his son and his advisors made the decision about the inheritance of the slave (v. 4b). This interpretation builds further on the second explanation of the parable in *Sim.* 5,5 and following, where it is explained that the field stands for the present world; the owner for God; the son for the Holy Spirit; the slave for the Son of God; the vines for the people (v. 2); the weeds for the lawless deeds of the servants of God; and the friends for God's holy angels (v. 3). According to the interpretation that follows, "God made the pre-existent Holy Spirit . . . to dwell in the flesh that he chose".¹³ Since this flesh did on earth neither defile the indwelling Spirit nor itself (vv. 5–6), God chose the flesh as "partner" (κοινωνός) for the Holy Spirit (v. 6). God decided in the presence of his son (the Holy Spirit) and his angels (his counsellors) that this particular flesh should have "some dwelling place" (τόπον τινὰ κατασκηνώσεως), lest it would lose "the reward for its service" (τὸν μισθὸν τῆς δουλείας αὐτῆς, v. 7a). "All flesh", as the author concludes, "in which the Holy Spirit has dwelt, which is to be found undefiled and clean, will be rewarded".¹⁴ In the following passage (5,7) the Shepherd explains to Hermas what this reward means: if Hermas does neither defile his flesh nor the Spirit that dwells in it (vv. 1–2.4),¹⁵ his flesh, which he should not regard as "perishable" (φθαρτή, v. 2), will be "justified" (δικαιωθῆ) by God (v. 1), so that Hermas will be saved (σωθήσεται, v. 3) and "live to God" (ζήσῃ τῷ θεῷ, v. 4).

Osiek thinks all this is about "the dignity of persons in view of the resurrection and exaltation of the faithful, with Christ as firstfruits".¹⁶ This position

13 See *Sim.* 5,6,5: τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸ προόν . . . κατώκισεν ὁ θεὸς εἰς σάρκα ἣν ἡβούλετο.

14 See *Sim.* 5,6,7b: πᾶσα γὰρ σὰρξ ἀπολήμψεται μισθὸν ἢ εὐρεθεῖσα ἀμίαντος καὶ ἄσπιλος, ἐν ᾗ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον κατώκησεν.

15 In *Sim.* 5,6–7 τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον is God's Holy Spirit. There is no reason to assume that in *Sim.* 5,6,7a "the Holy Spirit" is meant and in v. 7b "a holy spirit". See esp. *Sim.* 5,5,2: "The son is the Holy Spirit" (ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιόν ἐστιν); *Sim.* 5,6,7 (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον); and 5,7,2 (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον). It is God's Holy Spirit that dwells in the chosen servant as well as in all servants of God. Pace BROX, *Hirt*, esp. p. 324.

16 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 181. See also JOLY, *Hermas*, p. 241 n. 3 (on *Sim.* 5,7,2): "Il faut voir ici une profession de foi en la résurrection de la chair"; GIET, *Hermas*, p. 222 n. 1, who thinks that the passage refers to "l'immortalité de l'homme, encore que cette immortalité puisse inclure la résurrection des corps dont il n'est pas parlé"; T.H.C. VAN EIJK, *La résurrection des morts chez les Pères apostoliques* (ThH, 25), Paris, Beauchesne, 1974,

is, however, problematic for several reasons. One objection is that resurrection terminology is not used. Hill's argument, that Hermas takes resurrection belief for granted, is unconvincing. He writes: "The near silence of Hermas on the resurrection is . . . due to the accepted and uncontroverted place which the doctrine had with Hermas and his readers".¹⁷ Hermas is, however, known for asking things *ad nauseam* which seem to be, at least in the eyes of his revelatory agents, pretty much obvious; a rhetorical device used to emphasize important issues.¹⁸ According to Osiek, it is difficult to think that behind the idea of the incorruptibility of the flesh there is something else than resurrection belief. She thinks that the Shepherd's objection to the idea that the flesh is perishable resembles that of 1 Cor 15,12 and of 2 *Clem.* 9,1.¹⁹ But Hermas' idea that the flesh is "not . . . perishable" (μή . . . φθαρτή, *Sim.* 5,7,2) seems to disagree with Paul's view that flesh and blood cannot inherit "imperishableness" (ἀφθαρσία, 1 Cor 15,50). Moreover, Paul and Clement explicitly refer to the resurrection by using the terms ἀνάστασις, respectively ἀνίσταται, but Hermas does not do so. As Lake writes, Hermas "seems to have nothing to say about a resurrection, and apparently was content with immortality".²⁰

pp. 87, 93–95, who assumes that a resurrection of the dead is implied; and, more recently, C. SETZER, *Resurrection of the Body in Early Judaism and Early Christianity: Doctrine, Community, and Self-Definition*, Leiden – Boston, MA, Brill, 2004, p. 74: "By this time [i.e., the time of Justin Martyr, around the middle of the second century CE], an idea merely alluded to in the Apostolic Fathers has assumed definite form: that belief in resurrection of the body is a mark of orthodoxy", with a reference in n. 7 to *Herm. Sim.* 5,6,5–7. But cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 509 n. 10: "von Christi Auferstehung ist keine Rede, ebensowenig von seiner Himmelfahrt". There is no reference to *Hermas* in F. AVEMARIE – H. LICHTENBERGER (eds.), *Auferstehung—Resurrection. The Fourth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium: Resurrection, Transfiguration and Exaltation in Old Testament, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Tübingen, September, 1999) (WUNT, 135), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2001; and T. NICKLAS – F.V. REITERER – J. VERHEYDEN (eds.), in Collaboration with H. BRAUN, *The Human Body in Death and Resurrection* (DCLX), Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 2009.

17 See C.E. HILL, *Regnum Caelorum: Patterns of Future Hope in Early Christianity* (OECs), Oxford, Clarendon, 1992, p. 82.

18 See, e.g., *Vis.* 3,6,5 and 3,8,9.

19 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 183 with n. 9.

20 See K. LAKE, *Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity* (The Beginnings of Christianity), London, MacMillan, 1920, p. 111. Lake adds: "But this may be merely an accident and cannot be pressed". See further VAN EIJK, *La résurrection*, p. 95: "Pour notre auteur [Hermas] . . . il n'y a aucune discontinuité; de la manière maladroite dont il s'exprime on pourrait même conclure que la chair possède déjà l'incorruptibilité en ce qu'elle n'est pas φθαρτή". Van Eijk, however, regards this incorruptibility as an aspect of Hermas' views on the resurrection. See p. 95: "Il s'agit ici d'un aspect important de la doctrine de la

Another objection is that the analogy between *Sim.* 5,6,7a and b should not be pushed too far. According to Osiek, these verses imply that what applies to Jesus' "flesh" (ἡ σὰρξ αὐτῆς, v. 7a), applies to "all flesh" (πᾶσα . . . σὰρξ, v. 7b). She assumes that Jesus' reward is exemplary for the reward that all believers will receive. In terms of the parable, the exaltation of God's servant Jesus as reward for his service serves as an example of what is in store for all servants of God.²¹ The analogy does, however, not imply that Jesus and believers get the same reward, but that both are rewarded. "All flesh" will receive "a reward" (v. 7b), not "the same reward" as Jesus. Jesus was exalted and received a place among God and the Holy Spirit as adopted son and heir.²² Believers will be justified and saved and will live to God. Between v. 7a and b the perspective shifts from an adoptionist Christology to soteriology.²³ So, it goes too far to say that Jesus is portrayed as "firstfruits".

It is important to note that in *Hermas* Jesus' death is not portrayed as salvific. The reference to the slave's weeding of the vineyard, which the text interprets as the purification of the people's sins, is sometimes taken as a reference to Jesus' redemptive suffering.²⁴ But it is not called suffering, but labour and

résurrection"; and: "Mais celui-ci voit au moins la chair ressuscitée douée d'incorruptibilité et d'esprit".

21 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 179–181.

22 This does not imply that the Son of God has become divine. See A.Y. COLLINS, *Ancient Notions of Transferal and Apotheosis in Relation to the Empty Tomb Story in Mark*, in T.K. SEIM – J. ØKLAND (eds.), *Metamorphoses: Resurrection, Body and Transformative Practices in Early Christianity* (Ekstasis, 1), Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 2009, pp. 41–57, p. 45: "the epithet 'son of God' does not necessarily imply full divinity" (no ref. to *Hermas*).

23 Commentators who argue for an adoptionist Christology in *Hermas* include LAKE, *Landmarks*, pp. 104 n. 2.107.111; DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 572–576; G. KRETSCHMAR, *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie* (BHTh, 21), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1956, p. 117 n. 1 ("Adoptionslehre"); H. OPITZ, *Ursprünge frühkatholischer Pneumatologie. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehung der Lehre vom Heiligen Geist in der römischen Gemeinde unter Zugrundelegung des 1. Clemensbriefes und des "Hirten" des Hermas*, Berlin, Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1960, pp. 58–59; BROX, *Hirt*, p. 327; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 179–181 (with reservations). A humiliation-exaltation Christology is not envisioned. See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 178 (on *Sim.* 5,6,1). It is not clear how the adoptionist Christology (*Sim.* 5,6,7) relates to the implied pre-existence of the Son of God (e.g., *Sim.* 9,12,2). P. HENNE, *La christologie chez Clément de Rome et dans le Pasteur d'Hermas* (Par., 33), Fribourg, Éditions Universitaires, pp. 172–174, proposes that *Sim.* 5,6,4–8 is not about Christology at all, but about the relationship between flesh and spirit in an anthropological sense. Cf. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 180, who refutes Henne's position.

24 See DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 570: "Gemeint ist ganz offenbar das Leiden Christi". Cf. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 177 n. 17: "the slave-son is rewarded for fidelity even in suffering (6.2)

exertion.²⁵ Moreover, it is stated that “after he [the Son] had purified the sins of the people, he showed them the paths of life and gave them the Law, which he had received from his Father”.²⁶ So, the preceding purifying act was not his death. The exaltation of the Son is in *Hermas* not God’s vindication of the one who suffered and died, but a reward for the one who served God beyond normal expectations. Whereas the Son was exalted to heaven, all faithful servants will live to God. Being exalted, being transferred from the earthly to the heavenly world, living to God, etc. is not the same as resurrection. In *Hermas* resurrection of either Jesus or others is no theme.²⁷

1.2 *Angelic Afterlife*

A second position is that *Hermas* would envision an angelic afterlife. This is partly based on the idea that *Hermas* would imply an angel Christology.²⁸ It has been argued that the glorious angel mentioned in the text would be the Son of God.²⁹ God’s Son is, however, not considered to be or to appear as an

[i.e., *Sim.* 5,6,2] by exaltation”. For the slave’s weeding of the vineyard, see *Sim.* 5,2,4. For its interpretation, see *Sim.* 5,5,3 and 5,6,2.

25 See *Sim.* 5,6,2. For the use of κόπος and μόχθος in the sense of “labour” and “exertion”, see esp. *Man.* 2,4; *Sim.* 9,24,2 (ἐκ τῶν κόπων); 1 Thess 2,9; and 2 Thess 3,8 (κόπῳ καὶ μόχθῳ).

26 See *Sim.* 5,6,3.

27 *Hermas* does not refer to Jesus’ ascension either. Cf. W. BAUER, *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1909, p. 275, who thinks that the silence of *Hermas* (and other early Christian authors) on the ascension is just a matter of coincidence.

28 It has been argued that an angel Christology is the earliest Christology. See esp. M.S. WERNER, *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas problemgeschichtlich dargestellt*, Bern, Haupt; Tübingen, Katzmann, 1941, rev. and trans. by S.G.F. BRANDON as *The Formation of Christian Dogma: An Historical Study of Its Problem*, London, Black, 1957. Werner’s thesis is rejected by, among others, W. MICHAELIS, *Zur Engelchristologie im Urchristentum. Abbau der Konstruktion Martin Werners* (GBTh, 1), Basel, Majer, 1942; and C. ROWLAND, *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*, London, SPCK, 1982, p. 112, who points at (a lack of scholarly discussions on) “the influence of angel-christology on primitive Christian doctrine”.

29 See, e.g., the letter of F.S. MACKENZIE to K. LAKE, quoted in LAKE, *Landmarks*, pp. 137–140; DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, esp. pp. 575–576; H. MOXNES, *God and His Angel in the Shepherd of Hermas*, in *StTh* 28 (1974) 49–56 (God’s Son as *malak Yahweh*); KOESTER, *Einführung*, p. 695: “nur ein sehr aufmerksamer Leser des ganzen Buches kann erkennen, daß dieser Engel dem ‘Sohn Gottes’ gleichzusetzen ist”; and HVALVIK, *Jewish Believers*, p. 214: “there are reasons to think that they [Christ and the angel] in some way are seen as identical. A possibility is that the Son of God appears in the form of an angel. Whatever the solution is, the connection between Christology and angelology clearly has a Jewish ring”. This

angel.³⁰ The glorious angel is identified as Michael.³¹ There is no reason to assume that this identification applies only to this passage,³² or that Michael is, in his turn, to be identified as the Son of God.³³ In *Hermas* the Son of God is distinguished from the angels.³⁴ An angel Christology does not seem to be implied.

Furthermore, the references in *Hermas* to some kind of fellowship with the angels do not mean that the dead are transformed into angels, but that they are accompanied by angels. In *Vis.* 2,2,7 it is stated that the righteous will have a “passage with the angels” (ἡ πάροδος μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων). In *Sim.* 9,25,2 a similar “passage with the angels” is granted to righteous apostles and teachers who preached the word of the Lord to the world with reverence and holiness. In *Sim.* 9,24,4 the “angel of μετάνοια” exhorts believers represented by the seventh mountain of the parable to stay the way they are (a remarkable exhortation for an angel of μετάνοια!), because “the Lord . . . has inscribed you in our number”. Finally, *Sim.* 9,27,3 states that the “place” of bishops and hospitable people who always gave shelter to the needy is “already with the angels”. These references do not prove, however, that an angelic afterlife is implied.³⁵ Even if some

view is rejected by, among others, GIET, *Hermas*, pp. 227–228; PERNVEDEN, *Concept of the Church*, pp. 58–64; and A. MOYO, *Angels and Christology in the Shepherd of Hermas* (PhD thesis, Harvard University, 1978), pp. 58–59. For the great and honourable angel, see esp. *Vis.* 5,2; *Man.* 5,1,7; *Sim.* 5,4,4; 7,1,3; 8,1,2; and 9,1,3.

30 For the latter, the term “angelomorphism” is used. See, e.g., BROX, *Hirt*, esp. pp. 490–492; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 35, 204.

31 See *Sim.* 8,3,3.

32 Pace OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 34 n. 258.

33 Pace MACKENZIE in LAKE, *Landmarks*, p. 138; and, more recently, E. MULLER, *A Distinctive Feature of Early Roman Angelomorphic Christology*, in *StPatr* 45 (2010) 285–290, pp. 285–286, who argues that the glorious angel is to be understood as God’s Son, who is to be identified with Michael. This position is rejected by, e.g., GIET, *Hermas*, p. 228 n. 2; PERNVEDEN, *Concept of the Church*, pp. 58–64; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 33 n. 251.

34 See *Sim.* 5,6,4,7; 9,6,1; 9,7,1; and 9,12,6–8. For *Sim.* 9,6,1, “a man so tall (ἀνὴρ τις ὑψηλὸς τῷ μέγθει) that he was higher than the tower”, cf. *Gos. Pet.* 40, where Christ is very tall. For further parallels, see M.G. MARA, *Évangile de Pierre* (SC, 201), Paris, Cerf, 1973, p. 185 with n. 4.

35 For the idea of an angelic afterlife, see LAKE, *Apostolic Fathers*, II, pp. 21 n. 2, 315 n. 1. Cf. BUCUR, *Angelomorphic Pneumatology*, p. 48 n. 180 (on *Vis.* 2,6,7; *Sim.* 9,24,4; and 9,25,2): “becoming ‘coheir with the son’ (Herm. *Sim.* 5.2.7–8) is, logically, a status superior to that of the angelic counselors; this would suggest (although *Hermas* never says it explicitly) that the exalted Christian will be placed *above* the angels”. It is, however, Jesus who is exalted and becomes “coheir”, not ordinary Christian believers.

ancient texts demonstrate a belief in an angelic afterlife,³⁶ the references in *Hermas* do not really say this.

Hill's suggestion that the above-mentioned passages have a Christological meaning is worth consideration.³⁷ Since *Sim.* 9,12,8 states that even the angels must go through the gate of the tower, which is the Son of God, to come before God, Hill has argued that the enrolment (*Sim.* 9,24,4) or passing (*Vis.* 2,2,7 and *Sim.* 9,25,2) with the angels means that believers pass with the angels through the gate into the tower, that is to say, through the Son they get access to God in the heavenly world.³⁸ A more widely accepted interpretation is that the deceased will be "conveyed to heaven by angels" and that "their heavenly destiny is assured in company with the angels".³⁹ These interpretations rightly suggest that some kind of company with the angels is meant rather than a transformation into angelic figures. For *Hermas*, angels are "spirits". Whereas *Man.* 5,1–2 refers to "indwelling spirits (πνεύματα) that lead persons in one direction or the other", in *Man.* 6,2 they are called "angels (ἄγγελοι) of justice and evil".⁴⁰ If *Hermas*, who does not seem to distinguish between angels and spirits, would indeed believe in an angelic afterlife, why then does he stress that the *flesh* is imperishable? Furthermore, the scene in which the heavenly Rhoda appears to *Hermas* in a vision and tells him from the open heaven that she has been "taken up" (ἀνελήμφθην) does not depict her as an angel.⁴¹ An angelic afterlife does not seem to be implied.

36 Cf. LAKE, *Apostolic Fathers*. II, pp. 21 n. 2, 315 n. 1; and JOLY, *Hermas*, p. 93 n. 3. See also J.J. COLLINS, *The Afterlife in Apocalyptic Literature*, in A.J. AVERY-PECK – J. NEUSNER (eds.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity*. IV. *Death, Life-After-Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Late Antiquity* (HO, 1/49), Leiden, Brill, 2000, pp. 119–139; and ID., *The Angelic Life*, in SEIM – ØKLAND, *Metamorphoses*, pp. 291–310 (with refs.).

37 See HILL, *Regnum Caelorum*, p. 87.

38 For the motif of coming before God, or even seeing God, without dying, see, e.g. Irenaeus, *Haer.* 4,20,8 (ed. BROX): one will in the future see God (*futurum autem erat ut homo... videret <Deum>*, ll. 3–4); "the Prophets... saw the invisible God, as Isaiah says: 'I have seen the King, the Lord of Sabaoth, with my own eyes', with which he indicated that one will see God with his eyes and that one will hear His voice" (*prophetiae* [ll. 11–12]... *invisibilem videbant Deum, quemadmodum Esaias ait: 'Regem Dominum Sabaoth vidi oculis meis', significans quoniam videbit oculis Deum homo et vocem eius audiet*, ll. 14–17).

39 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 55(cit.), 248–250.

40 *Ibid.*, p. 32 (cit.).

41 See *Vis.* 1,1,3–9.

1.3 *Ascension of the Soul to Heaven*

A third position is that in *Hermas* resurrection has been replaced by an ascension of the soul to heaven.⁴² Yet, a body-soul dualism is not present in the text. Moreover, it is not the immortality of the soul, but of the human flesh that is envisioned. One is to be careful with interpreting *Hermas* from later patristic writings.

2 A Continued Existence

In the light of the evidence, it seems that *Hermas* envisions (only) a continued existence with an emphasis on the collective life of the Christian community.

2.1 *Continued Existence*

Hermas seems to envision a continued existence of the “flesh”, that is, of the body representing the whole person.⁴³ The destiny of this body is the heavenly world.⁴⁴

In ancient thought, life after death did not necessarily require a physical transformation. Examples include the biblical story on Elijah in 2 Kings 2, the story on Persephone in Greek mythology (though this story has an underworldly rather than a heavenly view on the hereafter) and the Roman story of

42 See PERNVEDEN, *Concept of the Church*, p. 273, following P. VOLZ, *Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba*, Tübingen – Leipzig, Mohr Siebeck, 1903; rev. *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1934, p. 120; and R. SCHNACKENBURG, *Gottes Herrschaft und Reich. Eine biblisch-theologische Studie*, Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 1959, p. 226, referring to *Sim.* 9,16,2–4.

43 See *Sim.* 5,6,7. See also GIET, *Hermas*, p. 221, who argues that in *Hermas* σάρξ means “la chair animée ou l’homme tout entier” (see also pp. 186 n. 2 and 268–269); and BROX, *Hirt*, p. 326 (with refs.), who argues that in *Sim.* 5,7,2 “flesh” and “spirit” should not be taken dualistically, but that “flesh” means the whole person. Pace H.E. LONA, *Über die Auferstehung des Fleisches. Studien zur frühchristlichen Eschatologie* (BZNW, 66), Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 1993, p. 74 n. 194, who argues that it is hard to believe that a Jewish Christian author like *Hermas* would have considered the flesh to be immortal (“nicht vergänglich”).

44 See esp. *Vis.* 1,1,4–5: the deceased Rhoda has been “taken up” (ἀνελήμφθην, v. 5) to “heaven” (οὐρανός, v. 4). For the same combination of terms, see also Mark 16,19; and Acts 1,11.

See further *Sim.* 1. See also HILL, *Regnum Caelorum*, p. 82. But cf. ZAHN, *Hirt*, pp. 123–124: “Rom und das himmlische Jerusalem: das ist der Gegensatz, in welchem sich das ganze Gleichnis bewegt”; and SNYDER, *Shepherd*, p. 95: “the two cities are not earthly and heavenly . . . but church and state”.

the apotheosis of Romulus.⁴⁵ An obvious objection would be that these examples do not involve ordinary human beings. Interestingly, however, in the scene in which Hermas sees the heavenly Rhoda, he says that he has always regarded her “as a goddess”.⁴⁶ Whereas some ancient scribes tried to wipe out this “strikingly unchristian”⁴⁷ expression, modern scholars usually try to explain it away by arguing that it is perhaps just reverential.⁴⁸ The combination of ὡς θεάν (*Vis.* 1,1,7), ἀνελήμφθην (v. 5) and οὐρανός (v. 4) may indicate, however, that Hermas plays on apotheosis terminology. The examples of Elijah, Persephone, Romulus and Rhoda may be different, but all illustrate the idea of a continued existence without a physical transformation.

Just as the myth on Persephone, who spends three months of the year in/with Hades and nine months among the living, Hermas emphasizes not so much the disruption between life and death as the continuity between the two.⁴⁹ In the opening scene of the book, the attention shifts instantly from the earthly Rhoda to the heavenly Rhoda. When she appears to Hermas in a vision, she greets him from heaven (v. 4), tells him that she has been taken up (v. 5), has an argument with him about the sinfulness of his previous sexual desires

45 For Elijah and Romulus, see COLLINS, *Ancient Notions*, *passim*. For Persephone, see V. SORGE-MØLLER, “With What Kind of Body Will They Come?”. *Metamorphosis and the Concept of Change: From Platonic Thinking to Paul’s Notion of the Resurrection of the Dead*, in SEIM – ØKLAND, *Metamorphoses*, pp. 109–122, p. 116.

46 See *Vis.* 1,1,7: ὡς θεάν.

47 See DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 434, “auffallend unchristlich”.

48 For the former, see manuscripts A (θυγατέρα); E (*dominam*); and L² (*om.*). S Bo and L¹ (TORNAU – CECCONI, *Vulgata*, p. 40: *deam*) read θεάν. Since “goddess” is the *lectio difficilior*, the other readings are probably secondary. It is more likely that a copyist or translator changed “goddess” into “daughter”, or “madam”, or omitted the word altogether, than that “daughter” or “madam” were changed into “goddess”, or that “goddess” was added. θεάν is accepted by WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN. For the latter, see esp. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 44. Others think that the use of “goddess” stems from a pagan background. See, e.g., LEUTZSCH, *Wahrnehmung*, p. 33 n. 89, who explains it from the deification of lovers in Greco-Roman erotic literature; and J. RÜPKE, *Der Hirte des Hermas. Plausibilisierungs- und Legitimierungsstrategien im Übergang von Antike und Christentum*, in ZAC 8 (2005) 276–298, p. 296: “[as a goddess] charakterisiert Hermas ebenso wie der Sibyllenglaube bewußt als noch in seinem nichtchristlichen kulturellen Hintergrund verhaftet”. Again others point at the use of the term “god” in biblical literature. See, e.g., VAN DEEMTER, *Hirt*, p. 94, who points at several biblical “parallels” (Ex 4,16; Ps 138,1; and Joh 10,35, to which, e.g., 2 Sam 28,13 could be added), though does not deny possible Hellenistic influence.

49 See SORGE-MØLLER, *What Kind of Body*, p. 116, who argues this for the myth on Persephone (no ref. to *Hermas*).

for her (vv. 5–9) and laughs at him (v. 8). Rhoda's transferral from earth to heaven is not described as a transformation. An interesting similarity between the apotheosis of Romulus in the version of Ovid and the exaltation of the Son of God in *Hermas* is that the transferral is in both texts called a "reward".⁵⁰ Perhaps, then, for *Hermas* eternal life is not so much a matter of being changed from mortal to immortal as of an inherent human quality which manifests itself by the will of God.⁵¹

Hermas does not seem to reflect on the question how the idea of a continued existence could possibly be reconciled with the fact that people do experience death and decay. Unlike Paul in 1 Cor 15,50 *Hermas* does not say that "flesh and blood" cannot inherit "imperishableness". On the contrary, he states that the human flesh is "imperishable". And unlike Paul in 2 Cor 5,1 he does not speak of a new, celestial body. Furthermore, *Hermas* does not say that (eventually) there will be a resurrection of the dead. Here it is important to note that there is no reason to discount *Hermas*' views. As a matter of fact, an unreflective use of various traditions on the hereafter is typical of a variety of early Christian writings. Other examples are, for instance, Matt 27,52–53 and Luke 16,22–31. In these traditions, the gap between death and afterlife is not seen as problematic.

2.2 Reward and Punishment

In *Hermas* a continued existence is granted only to the faithful and righteous. Only they will live forever; the unfaithful or unrighteous will die.⁵² Whereas

50 See Ovid, *Metam.* 14,808–811 (ed. MILLER – GOOLD): "time has come... to grant the reward (that was promised...) and to take him away from earth and to place him in heaven" (*tempus adest... praemia, (sunt promissa...) solvere et ablatum terris inponere caelo*). *Herm. Sim.* 5,6,7 uses the word *μίσθός*.

51 Cf. LONA, *Über die Auferstehung*, p. 74, who states that the "Unvergänglichkeit" is no quality of the flesh, but a possibility which is actualized when the flesh remains uncorrupted.

52 The "faithful and righteous" are those who fear the Lord and keep his commandments (*Man.* 7,4–5), who know God (*Sim.* 9,18,2), who, if they did evil, changed (*Sim.* 8,6,3), etc. The "unfaithful" or "unrighteous" are those who fear the Lord but do not keep his commandments (*Man.* 7,4–5), who do not know God, or who do know God, but, having done evil things (*Sim.* 9,18,2), did not change (*Sim.* 8,6,5), etc. Faith and righteousness are prerequisite for salvation. One is to be a baptized believer and to live a virtuous life. For this reason, the pre-Christian righteous need to be baptized before they can be incorporated into the tower (*Sim.* 9,16,1.7)—a version of the traditional *descensus ad inferos* motif (see also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 238). *Sim.* 9,16 does not envision a resurrection. The issue is that the pre-Christian righteous lived before their baptism outside the tower in the underworld (in "the depth", v. 1). Once they were baptized by apostles and teachers, who

the former will “live to God”, the latter will “die to God”.⁵³ The righteous “will never perish”, are chosen by God for eternal life and will live on in the world to come,⁵⁴ etc. The others, by contrast, “will lose their life”, “will be killed”, will be “put” or “devastated” to death (that is, to “eternal destruction”),⁵⁵ etc. As the wording indicates, the contrast between life and death is that between living on (a continued existence) and perishing.

Life beyond death is a reward for faithfulness and righteousness.⁵⁶ Death, in its turn, is a punishment for unrepentant sinners. In *Vis.* 2,3,2 salvation is described as “surviving into eternal life”.⁵⁷ In *Sim.* 9,18,2, by contrast, it is stated that those who do not know God and do evil are “condemned to death” and that those who do know God and do evil will be “punished doubly and will die forever”.⁵⁸ In *Sim.* 4 budding trees stand for the just: they will live in the world to come (v. 2). Dry trees represent “outsiders” and “sinners”: both will be “burnt”: the former “because they did not know their creator”; the latter

proclaimed (κηρύξαντες) to them the name of the Son of God (vv. 4–5), they became part of the tower/church. Their former “deadliness” (νέκρωσις, v. 2) refers not to their death, but to their pre-baptismal state (see esp. v. 3). For the *descensus ad inferos* motif in combination with preaching, see, e.g., 1 Pet 3,19; 4,6; *Or. Sib.* 8,310–311; and *Gos. Pet.* 41. For a comparison of the last two passages, see T. NICKLAS, *Apokryphe Passionstraditionen im Vergleich. Petrus-evangelium und Sibyllinische Orakel (Buch VIII)*, in T.J. KRAUS – T. NICKLAS (eds.), *Das Evangelium nach Petrus. Text, Kontexte, Intertexte* (TU, 158), Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 2007, pp. 263–279, p. 276.

- 53 For the expression ζήση τῷ θεῷ, see esp. *Man.* 3,5; 4,4,3; 6,2,10; 8,12; and 10,3,4. For ἀποθάνητε τῷ θεῷ, see esp. *Sim.* 8,6,4 and 9,28,5. For the idea that in Hermas’ view the righteous will live and the ungodly will die, see also, e.g., G.W.E. NICKELSBURG, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity* (HTS, 56), Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 2006, p. 198; and T. DE BRUIN, *The Great Controversy: The Individual’s Struggle between Good and Evil in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in Their Jewish and Christian Contexts* (NTOA, 106), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015, p. 223.
- 54 For the former, see *Vis.* 2,3,3: μακάριοι πάντες οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν δικαιοσύνην. οὐ διαφθαρήσονται ἕως αἰῶνος. For the latter, see *Vis.* 4,3,5: ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐπερχόμενός ἐστιν, ἐν ᾧ κατοικήσουσιν οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ . . . οἱ ἐκλελεγμένοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς ζωὴν αἰῶνιον.
- 55 See, resp., *Sim.* 8,6,6: ὅσοι δὲ οὐ μετανοήσουσιν, ἀπώλεσαν τὴν ζωὴν αὐτῶν; *Sim.* 9,20,4: παραδοθήσονται ταῖς γυναῖξιν ἐκείναις, αἵτινες αὐτοὺς θανατώσουσιν (see also 9,26,8); *Man.* 12,1,2: τούτους οὖν παραδίδωσιν εἰς θάνατον; *Sim.* 9,26,6: καταφθαρήσεται εἰς θάνατον; and *Sim.* 6,2,4: ὁ δὲ θάνατος ἀπώλειαν ἔχει αἰῶνιον.
- 56 See esp. *Sim.* 5,6,7, where the word μισθός is used.
- 57 *Vis.* 2,3,2 states that Hermas’ righteousness and faithfulness to God “saved him” (σώζει σε . . . σέσωκέν σε . . .) and “will save all” (καὶ πάντας σώζει) who do the same. “Such people” will “survive into eternal life” (οἱ τοιοῦτοι . . . παραμενοῦσιν εἰς ζωὴν αἰῶνιον).
- 58 *Sim.* 9,18,2: κεκριμένοι εἰσὶν εἰς θάνατον; and: δισσῶς κολασθήσονται καὶ ἀποθανοῦνται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

“because they sinned, but did not change” (v. 4). As *Man.* 12,6,3 states, God can “save and destroy”.⁵⁹ There are those who are saved and those who will perish.⁶⁰ A continued existence is itself a sign of salvation, not a means by which all humans will be judged.

2.3 *Community Life*

Salvation is in *Hermas* connected with membership of the Christian community. In *Vis.* 3,8 salvation (v. 3) is described as having “a dwelling in the tower (the church) with God’s holy ones” (v. 8).⁶¹ In *Vis.* 3,6,1 it is stated that stones (believers) which are not “useful” for the building of the tower will not be saved.⁶² Within this dualism, *Hermas* introduces at some points a third category, namely of believers who had part in the righteous world, sinned, were willing to change, but changed too late.⁶³ For them, there will be a permanent lesser place,⁶⁴ which is described as an “inferior place”, as a “dwelling inside the first walls” or “alongside the tower”, etc.⁶⁵ In *Sim.* 8,7,3.5 the fate of the three categories is summarized: “those who have changed have a dwelling place in the tower; those who have changed more slowly will have a dwelling in the walls; and those who are not changed . . . will die” (v. 3), that is, they are thrown out of the tower and will lose their lives (v. 5).

At the end of time the tower will look like a monolith.⁶⁶ This means that “the church will be one body, one thinking, one mind, one faith, one love”.⁶⁷ It will include past generations as well as the faithful and righteous who are still alive at the end of time.⁶⁸ Then “the Son of God will be glad and rejoice

59 *Man.* 12,6,3: σώσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι.

60 E. THOMASSEN, *Valentinian Ideas About Salvation as Transformation*, in SEIM – ØKLAND, *Metamorphoses*, pp. 169–186, pp. 169–170, argues something similar for Paul (1 Cor 1,18 and 2 Cor 2,15) and for the Valentinians (apud Epiphanius, *Pan.* 31,7,6–7).

61 See *Vis.* 3,8,3.8: σώζονται οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ (v. 3) . . . ἐν τῷ πύργῳ ἔξει τὴν κατοίκησιν μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων τοῦ θεοῦ (v. 8).

62 *Vis.* 3,6,1: οὐκ ἔχουσιν σωτηρίαν, ὅτι οὐκ εἰσιν εὐχρηστοὶ εἰς οἰκοδομήν.

63 See esp. *Vis.* 3,5,5 and 3,7,6.

64 See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 141; P. HENNE, *La pénitence et la rédaction du Pasteur d'Hermas*, in *RB* 98 (1991) 358–397, pp. 369–370; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 74–75.

65 See, resp., *Vis.* 3,7,6 (ἐτέρῳ δὲ τόπῳ ἀρμόσουσιν πολλὸ ἐλάττονι); *Sim.* 8,6,6 (ἐγένετο ἡ κατοικία αὐτῶν εἰς τὰ τεῖχη τὰ πρῶτα); and *Vis.* 3,5,5 (παρὰ τῷ πύργῳ κείνται).

66 See *Vis.* 3,2,6; *Sim.* 9,9,7; 9,13,5; and 9,18,3.

67 See *Sim.* 9,18,4.

68 See esp. *Vis.* 3,5,1, which explicitly states that the stones that fit in the building of the tower represent church leaders of both the past and present: some have fallen asleep; others are still alive.

in them, when he receives his cleansed people".⁶⁹ The plural indicates that community members will not eventually assimilate to oneness, but will be part of a perfectly harmonious community.⁷⁰ Salvation is a collective event; it is the continued existence of the church as community of believers.

Hill's suggestion that Hermas would take resurrection belief for granted, but would not explicitly refer to it because it would not fit well with the tower image is unconvincing.⁷¹ The tower image expresses one of the author's basic views on life beyond death: not as resurrected life, but as a continued existence of believers being part of the everlasting church.

There are in *Hermas* no indications of any objections against its views on the resurrection.⁷² It appears that in the context in which the work originated, such ideas could be expressed, not only within the author's own community, but also in other Christian communities with which there seem to have been contacts.⁷³ Hermas' ideas do not seem to have detracted very much, if anything, from the popularity of the writing in the early Christian world.

Concluding Remarks

Hermas does not envision a resurrection, an angelic afterlife, or an ascension of the soul to heaven, but a continued existence (*Sim.* 5,6–7). For Hermas, God's Son is not the risen-one, but the one who was adopted and exalted by God. The adoption and exaltation are no vindication of the one who suffered and died, but a reward for him who faithfully served God beyond normal expectations. Hermas envisions for the faithful and righteous eternal life as members of the everlasting church (see the visions of the tower). From a modern perspective, Hermas' views on the afterlife are not thoroughly thought-out, but it cannot be inferred that his views are, compared with other early Christian authors like the evangelists and Paul, a step backwards. An unreflective use of various traditions on the hereafter is typical of a wide variety of early Christian writings.

69 See *Sim.* 9,18,4.

70 See esp. *Vis.* 3,5,1, where συμφωνούντες is used as an architectural term with regard to the building of the tower; and συνεφώνησαν for righteous apostles, bishops, teachers and deacons who were always "in harmony" with each other.

71 Cf. HILL, *Regnum Caelorum*, pp. 81–82.

72 See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 328. Cf. LEBRETON, *Trinité*, p. 369 (on *Sim.* 5,5,5 and further): "ses visions et ses paraboles étaient bien connues dans la communauté romaine; elles y étaient, sans aucun doute, avidement lues et ardemment discutées, et l'écho de ces discussions y retentit souvent; dans le passage que nous lisons, il me semble particulièrement manifeste".

73 See esp. *Vis.* 2,4,3.

Sectarianism

In this chapter the question will be addressed to what extent *Hermas* shows “sectarian tendencies”.¹ The term “sect” is used here in the sense of a group that somehow claims to possess the truth and separates itself from society, either out of indifference or hostility, by creating strong boundaries between insiders (“we”) and outsiders (“they”). It is widely accepted that a group’s tension to the world is the most significant feature of a sectarian worldview from which other sectarian dimensions follow.² The model which will be used is that of

-
- 1 For this issue, see also MAIER, *Social Setting*, pp. 55–86, p. 59, “the primary concern of this author [Hermas] is to maintain the purity of the Christian sect through proper attitudes toward and uses of wealth”. Wealth is an important issue, but not the primary concern of the work as a whole: Hermas’ scope is wider. Cf. OSIEK, *Second Century*, p. 117: “the Shepherd is not ‘sectarian’ ... but mainstream in the Christianity of its time and place”. The present chapter includes material of my publication “A Jan Steen Household”: *The Domestic Church in the Shepherd of Hermas*, in T. KNieps – G. MANNION – P. DE MEY (eds.), *The Household of God and Local Households—Revisiting the Domestic Church* (BETL, 254), Leuven, Peeters, 2013, pp. 235–247. I thank Peeters for permission to include the material here.
 - 2 See R. STARK – W.S. BAINBRIDGE, *The Future of Religion: Secularization, Revival and Cult Formation*, Berkeley, CA – Los Angeles, CA – London, University of California Press, 1985, esp. p. 23, following B. JOHNSON, *On Church and Sect*, in *ASR* 28 (1963) 539–549, p. 542. The importance of the notion of “tension” is acknowledged also by sociologists of religion who argue for a model with more than one dimension. See, e.g., the two-dimensional model of M.B. MCGUIRE, *Religion: The Social Context*, Belmont, CA, Wadsworth, 2002⁵, pp. 155–162, who focuses on “group/society tension” (positive or negative) and “self-conceived legitimacy” (unique or pluralistic). According to McGuire (p. 156), a sect considers itself to be uniquely legitimate and has a relatively negative relationship with society. But cf. C. WASSEN – J. JOKIRANTA, *Groups in Tension: Sectarianism in the Damascus Document and the Community Rule*, in D.J. CHALCRAFT (ed.), *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (BWö), London – Oakville, Equinox, 2007, pp. 205–245, p. 209, who argue that the “self-conceived legitimacy” is, in fact, included within “tension”. B.R. WILSON, *An Analysis of Sect Development*, in ID. (ed.), *Patterns of Sectarianism: Organization and Ideology in Social and Religious Movements*, London, Heinemann, 1967, pp. 22–45, pp. 23–24, argues for a multidimensional model: “Typically a sect may be identified by the following characteristics: it is a voluntary association; membership is by proof to sect authorities of some claim to personal merit—such as knowledge of doctrine, affirmation of a conversion experience, or recommendation of members in good standing; exclusiveness is emphasised, and expulsion exercised against those who contravene doctrinal, moral or organisational precepts; its self-conception is of an elect, a gathered remnant, possessing special enlightenment; personal

Stark and Bainbridge, who define a sect as a religious group being in a state of tension with its socio-cultural environment, and who distinguish three inter-related elements of this tension: “difference” (that is, following deviant norms), “antagonism” (that is, claiming to possess the truth and to provide the only way to salvation) and “separation” (that is, favouring social relations among insiders as well as restricting social interaction with outsiders).³ Furthermore, the typology of Wilson will be used in order to establish the type of sectarianism: conversionist, revolutionist, introversionist, manipulationist, thaumaturgical, reformist or utopian.⁴

1 Difference: Unconventional Views on the Conventional Family

Hermas portrays himself as a family man with a wife and children.⁵ His views on the married state, however, seem to differ from the socio-cultural norm. He writes that it was revealed to him that his wife “will be as a sister (ἀδελφή)”.⁶

perfection is the expected standard of aspiration, in whatever terms this is judged; it accepts, at least as an ideal, the priesthood of all believers; there is a high level of lay participation; there is opportunity for the member spontaneously to express his commitment; the sect is hostile or indifferent to the secular society and to the state”. But WILSON, *Introduction*, in *ibid.*, pp. 1–21, p. 9, states that “all sects [...] maintain separation from the world, although the forms of separation vary”. E. REGEV, *Atonement and Sectarianism in Qumran: Defining a Sectarian Worldview in Moral and Halakhic Systems*, in CHALCRAFT, *Sectarianism*, pp. 180–204, p. 181, notes that Wilson acknowledges the defining notion of tension with the world and, further, that the pattern of tension is implicit in other characteristics of Wilson’s model. Regev (p. 181) concludes: “if the sectarian worldview is reduced to one major feature from which all others result, it is the view of tension towards the world”.

3 See STARK – BAINBRIDGE, *Future of Religion*, pp. 48–62.

4 Originally, Wilson distinguished between four ideal types: conversionist, adventist, introversionist and gnostic. See WILSON, *Analysis*, pp. 25–29. In his later works, Wilson refined his analysis to propose seven ideal types. See B.R. WILSON, *Religious Sects: A Sociological Study* (World University Library), London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1970, pp. 35–47. His final refinement discusses the different sectarian types in terms of “responses to the world”. See B.R. WILSON, *Magic and the Millennium: A Sociological Study of Religious Movements of Protest among Tribal and Third-World Peoples*, London, Heinemann, 1973, pp. 18–30. For an overview of Wilson’s eventual seven types, see also, e.g., L.L. GRABBE, *When Is a Sect a Sect—or Not? Groups and Movements in the Second Temple Period*, in CHALCRAFT, *Sectarianism*, pp. 114–132, p. 126.

5 See esp. *Vis.* 1,3,1–2; 2,2,2–3; 2,3,1; *Man.* 12,3,6; *Sim.* 5,3,9; and 7,6.

6 See *Vis.* 2,2,3.

“As a sister” refers to sexual abstinence.⁷ Hermas, a married family man, envisions an asexual relationship with his wife. This reflects the early Christian custom which later became known as “spiritual marriage”.⁸

Hermas’ views on divorce and remarriage in *Man.* 4 are a further indication that the author did not consider marriage to be the preferred way.⁹ The following rules, which apply to both husband and wife, are set out.¹⁰ For believers, divorce is mandatory if one knows that one’s partner has committed adultery and he or she does not change,¹¹ but remarriage is not allowed because one is to give one’s partner one second chance:¹² if the partner repents, one is to take him or her back.¹³ Remarriage after the death of one’s partner is allowed, but it is not encouraged: it is better to remain unmarried.¹⁴ Hermas does not seem to have a very positive view on the married state.¹⁵ His valuing of “spiritual marriage” and his mistrust of the married state challenge the conventional family and go against the common pattern of a society where marriage was the cultural norm.¹⁶

-
- 7 See also DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 426.445.619; BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 78.98.411; LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 397 n. 168; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 42.54.228. See further *Vis.* 1.1.1: Hermas loves Rhoda “as a sister” (ὡς ἀδελφὴν); and *Sim.* 9.11.3: Hermas sleeps with the young women “as a brother and not as a husband” (ὡς ἀδελφός, καὶ οὐχ ὡς ἀνὴρ). BROX, *Hirt*, p. 78, refers also to *Vis.* 1.1.7 and 2.3.1, but in these passages “sister” does not seem to have an asexual connotation. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 56, interprets: “sister . . . = wife”.
 - 8 See also OSIEK – BALCH, *Families*, p. 154. See further Chapter 5.
 - 9 An issue that will not be discussed is to what extent Hermas’ views are in agreement with Roman law (cf., e.g., OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 110–112). BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 205–206, notes that Hermas is not so much dealing with legal regulations as with religious rules, and: “in Auffassung und Praxis der Ehe setzen sich die Christen seit der Frühzeit von Konventionen und geltenden Auffassungen bewußt und anspruchsvoll ab”.
 - 10 See *Man.* 4.1.8.10. See further Chapter 5.
 - 11 See *Man.* 4.1.5–6. For a similar interpretation, see DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 505; BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 204–206; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 110–111.
 - 12 See *Man.* 4.1.6–8.
 - 13 See *Man.* 4.1.7–8. See also BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 206–207; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 110–111.
 - 14 See *Man.* 4.4.2. See also DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 513; BROX, *Hirt*, p. 214; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 116.
 - 15 See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 116: “these passages reflect an early stage of the development of Christian mistrust of second marriages and the ascetic valuing of celibacy”.
 - 16 See, e.g., E. D’AMBRA, *The Calculus of Venus: Nude Portraits of Roman Matrons*, in N.B. KAMPEN (ed.), *Sexuality in Ancient Art: Near East, Egypt, Greece, and Italy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996, pp. 219–232, esp. pp. 221 and 225.

2 Antagonism: *Hermas'* Horizon

Hermas' views on the church can be used to see how strong his antagonism to the outside world is. A first question is how broad his perspective is. A second question is whether he proclaims the church to be the only way.

For Hermas, the church seems to be all that matters. It is the church that needs to be changed. First there is the "house" (οἶκος) which needs to be "changed", "healed" and "purified" from its sins.¹⁷ The term οἶκος is used in various ways. In some passages it refers to Hermas' family, that is, to Hermas, his wife and their children.¹⁸ In other passages it refers to the household¹⁹ with Hermas as its head.²⁰ It has been argued that Hermas' οἶκος represents the Christian community.²¹ Hermas writes several times that what applies to the οἶκος, applies to the whole church, which seems to imply that the house is seen

-
- 17 For the first expression, see esp. *Man.* 2,7: "the change of your [i.e. Hermas'] household" (ἡ μετάνοια . . . τοῦ οἴκου σου). See also *Vis.* 1,3,1–2 and *Sim.* 7,2. For the second expression, see esp. *Vis.* 1,1,9: God will heal (ἰάσεται) the sins of Hermas' household (οἶκος). See also *Vis.* 1,3,1. For the "healing" of sins in general, see *Man.* 4,1,11; 12,6,2; *Sim.* 5,7,3,4; 7,4; 8,11,3; 9,23,5; and 9,28,5. For the third expression, see esp. *Vis.* 2,3,1: Hermas' children and sister (i.e., his wife) are to be purified (καθαρίζεσθαι) from their sins. See also *Sim.* 7,2 and 10,3,2,4.
- 18 See *Vis.* 1,3,1–2 (note the use of the terms "parents" [γονεῖς] and "children" [τέκνα]) and 2,3,1. See also, e.g., BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 88–89, 102; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 49, 56, who interpret οἶκος in these passages as Hermas' family (parents and children).
- 19 See esp. *Man.* 12,3,6 and *Sim.* 5,3,9. In *Man.* 12,3,6 the Shepherd warns Hermas that if he does not keep his commandments, there will be no salvation for him, his children, or his household. Similarly, in *Sim.* 5,3,9 the Shepherd wants Hermas, his children and his household to observe his teachings. In both passages οἶκος is used in the sense of "household" or "house church". Cf. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 547 ("Kinder und Familie (hier getrennt)"), 567; and BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 276, 314 (οἶκος means in both passages family). OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 152, interprets οἶκος in *Man.* 12,3,6 (she does not comment on the meaning in *Sim.* 5,3,9) as Hermas' household (involving family members and other members of his household).
- 20 In *Sim.* 7,3 Hermas is called "the head of the house" (ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ οἴκου). If οἶκος is the household, Hermas' function as *paterfamilias* is meant. See BROX, *Hirt*, p. 343 ("Familienhaupt"); and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 192. If οἶκος is the house church, Hermas' function as host of the Christian community assembling in his house may be referred to. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 585, thinks that Hermas' family stands for the Christian community, but does not interpret Hermas' function as ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ οἴκου ("Oberhaupt") as relating to the house church.
- 21 See esp. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 419–420, 445–446. See the Introduction.

as a unit of the church.²² Moreover, the οἶκος is presented as part of the οἶκος of God and of the οἰκοδομή of the tower, which both represent the church.²³ Most likely, therefore, the οἶκος stands for the house church. Perhaps Hermas is a host of a house church community.²⁴ It remains unknown whether Hermas' house church is real, or merely a notion or model.²⁵

Hermas' perspective is not limited to his house church, but is much wider. The message which Hermas receives from the woman church and which he writes down in three booklets²⁶ is to be communicated to various Christian circles. Hermas is to instruct the leaders of the ἐκκλησία in his city.²⁷ Most likely, ἐκκλησία means here the Christian community of Rome.²⁸ Grapte is to

22 See *Vis.* 1,1,9; 2,2,4; *Man.* 5,1,7; *Sim.* 5,3,9; and 7,7. Cf. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 435, 445–446, 515–516, 567, 586; BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 84, 87–88, 220, 314, 345; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 45, 55, 120, 174, 193, who do not interpret these verses in this way. But the fact that Hermas states something like “what applies to your οἶκος, applies to the church”, makes it plausible that οἶκος stands for the house church (“what applies to your house church, applies to the whole church”).

23 See the Introduction.

24 C.S. WANSINK, “You Will Be Restored Again to Your Office”: *Autobiographical Insights in The Shepherd of Hermas*, in A. ÖZEN (ed.), *Historische Wahrheit und theologische Wissenschaft. Gerd Lüdemann zum 50. Geburtstag*, Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, 1996, pp. 71–85, p. 75, argues that the statement in *Sim.* 7,6 that Hermas will be re-established in his place (τόπον M L¹ L² and E; οἶκον A) means that he will be restored to his office as church officer. But within the direct context, it is more likely that his position as *paterfamilias* is meant. OSIEK, *Family Matters*, p. 836, states that “Hermas is not a leader but a member of a Christian community”. This does not exclude the possibility, however, that Hermas may have acted as a host for gatherings of (parts of) the Christian community. The οἶκος terminology in *Hermas* indicates that Hermas may have lived in a (simple) *domus*. See *ibid.*: “At the time of writing, he [i.e., Hermas] is a freedman householder with an *oikos*, that is, a familial establishment, probably a modest *domus* of the kind to be seen at Pompeii or Herculaneum”. For the idea that Hermas lived in an *insula*, see H.O. MAIER, *From Material Place to Imagined Space: Emergent Christian Community as Thirdspace in the Shepherd of Hermas*, in M. GRUNDEKEN – J. VERHEYDEN (eds.), *Early Christian Communities between Ideal and Reality* (WUNT, 342), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2015, pp. 143–160. Also in such a tenement building, Hermas may have acted as host of a house church community.

25 Cf. OSIEK – BALCH, *Families*, p. 273 n. 55.

26 One for Hermas (*Vis.* 2,1,3–4), one for Clement and one for Grapte (*Vis.* 2,4,3).

27 See *Vis.* 2,2,6 and 2,4,3. Hermas is to bring the message “to the leaders of the church” (τοῖς προηγούμενοις τῆς ἐκκλησίας, 2,2,6); he is to read his booklet after completion “in this city with the presbyters who lead the church” (εἰς ταύτην τὴν πόλιν μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τῶν προΐσταμένων τῆς ἐκκλησίας, 2,4,3).

28 See also, e.g., OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 59: “the totality of the Christians in the city”.

admonish the widows and orphans within the local community.²⁹ Clement is to inform Christian communities in other cities.³⁰ The message is meant to reach all believers.³¹

Hermas' primary intended addressees are believers, but his perspective includes outsiders as well. Mission among non-believers is implied. For instance, *Vis.* 3,5,4 mentions new believers.³² *Vis.* 3,7,3 refers to people to whom the Word has been preached and who wished to be baptized in the name of the Lord, but eventually changed their mind.³³ In *Sim.* 8,3,2 the willow tree is interpreted as the law of God and as the Son of God, preached to the ends of the earth. As a result of this preaching, people from all over the world have come to believe. Finally, in *Sim.* 9,17,1–4 it is said that the Son of God was preached (ἐκκηρύχθη) to the twelve tribes (φύλαι) or people (ἔθνη) of the whole world (v. 1) and that “all the people that live under the heaven who heard and believed were called by the name of the Son of God” (v. 4).³⁴

29 See *Vis.* 2,4,3.

30 *Ibid.* Clement is to send his copy of the message “to the other cities” (εἰς τὰς ἄλλας πόλεις), that is to say, to Christian communities elsewhere. See also esp. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 453 (“An die auswärtigen Gemeinden”); and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 59.

31 In *Vis.* 2,1,3 the woman church asks Hermas to proclaim the message of the booklet “to God’s elect” (τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ). In *Vis.* 2,4,2 she commands him to communicate her message “to all the elect” (τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς πάντων). See also DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 453: “für die Christenheit bestimmt”; BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 106–107: “für alle . . . Die universale Verbreitung . . . durch Klemens, Grapte und H[ermas] selbst an jeweils andere Zielgruppen, insgesamt an alle Christen”; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 59: “The local church . . . [is] to receive the message directly from Hermas”; “the totality of the Christians in the city”; “The international scope of Clement’s charge”; and “the highest level of Christian assembly in the city”.

32 See *Vis.* 3,5,4: “those who are new in faith, yet believers” (νέοι εἰσὶν ἐν τῇ πίστει καὶ πιστοί). Unlike BROX, *Hirt*, p. 133 (“Neugetauften”) and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 71 (“neophytes”), DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 467, takes the new believers explicitly as converts (“die Bekehrung der Neulinge”), arguing that the fact that the newcomers are represented as stones which are “brought” (ἄγεσθαι) into the tower/church may have missionary overtones.

33 As DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 470, points out, “hearing the Word” (τὸν λόγον ἀκούειν) is “Terminus der Missionssprache”. He refers only to Mark 4,18, to which one could add, e.g., Matt 13,19–20,22–23; Mark 4,15–16,20; Luke 5,1; 8,11–15,21; 11,28; John 5,24; 14,24; Acts 4,4; 10,44; 13,7,44; 15,7; 19,10; Eph 1,13; Jas 1,22–23; and 1 John 2,7.

34 See *Sim.* 9,17,4: πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τὰ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν κατοικοῦντα, ἀκούσαντα καὶ πιστεύσαντα ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι ἐκλήθησαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. For an interpretation of *Sim.* 9,17 in terms of a worldwide mission, see DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 626; BROX, *Hirt*, p. 441 (“Weltmission”); and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 244. For the explanation of the twelve φύλαι as twelve ἔθνη, see *Sim.* 9,17,2 and 9,18,5.

Notwithstanding the broad perspective, Hermas considers the church to be uniquely legitimate. “God’s holy church” is the true community.³⁵ Believers are “God’s servants”, “God’s holy ones”, “God’s chosen ones”, etc.³⁶ It has been argued that the use of these terms may just be a way of honouring literary convention.³⁷ The wording indicates, however, that Hermas considers the Christian community to be exclusive and elect.

For Hermas, there is no salvation outside the church.³⁸ This idea is most clearly expressed in the image of the tower. For instance, *Vis.* 3,6,1 states that “stones” thrown far away from the tower, symbolizing “sons of lawlessness”, “have no salvation (οὐκ ἔχουσιν σωτηρίαν), because they are useless (οὐκ εἰσιν εὐχρηστοί) for the building”. Salvation and belonging to the tower/church are interrelated. In *Sim.* 4,4 dry trees symbolize “unbelievers” and “sinners”: “the sinners will be burnt, because they sinned but did not change. The unbelievers will be burnt because they did not know their creator”.³⁹ In *Sim.* 9,18,2 it is stated that “those who have not known God and do evil are sentenced to death, but those who have known God . . . and do evil will be punished doubly and die for ever”.⁴⁰ Most likely, this means that all “outsiders” (including believers who make themselves “outsiders”) will not be saved.⁴¹ It may seem that sinners who do not know God are thought of as being in a better position than sinners

-
- 35 For “God’s holy church” (ἡ ἀγία ἐκκλησία), see esp. *Vis.* 1,1,6; 1,3,4; and 4,1,3.
- 36 For God’s servants (δοῦλοι), see esp. *Vis.* 1,2,4; 4,1,3; *Man.* 4,1,8; 4,3,4; 5,2,1–2; 6,2,4,6; 8,6,10; 9,9; 10,1,2; 11,1; 12,1,3; 12,2,1–2; 12,5,2,4; *Sim.* 1,1,7,10; 2,2,4; 4,2,6; 5,5,3; 6,2,1; 6,3,6; 6,5,6–7; 8,6,5; 8,10,3; 9,13,7; 9,19,1,3; 9,20,2; 9,24,2; 9,26,3; 9,27,2; and 9,33,1. For God’s holy ones (ἄγιοι), *Vis.* 1,1,9; 1,3,2; 2,2,4–5; 3,3,3; 3,6,2(A L¹); 3,8,8–9,11; 4,3,6; and *Sim.* 8,8,1. For God’s chosen ones (ἐκλεκτοί), *Vis.* 1,3,4; 2,1,3; 2,2,5; 2,4,2; 3,5,1; 3,8,3; 3,9,10; 4,2,5; and 4,3,5.
- 37 Cf. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, esp. pp. 441 and 435, who takes δοῦλοι and ἐκλεκτοί as “eine von Israel übernommene Selbstbezeichnung der Christen” (p. 441), and ἄγιοι as a reference to “aller Christen” (p. 435); BROX, *Hirt*, esp. p. 84: “‘alle Heiligen’ = Christen”; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, esp. p. 47, who regards “servants of God” as a reference to “all Christians, perhaps an extension of biblical usage”.
- 38 The expression “outside the church there is no salvation” (*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*) is, of course, anachronistic, but it does seem to be a good summary of Hermas’ views on salvation in relation to the Christian community.
- 39 See *Sim.* 4,4: τὰ δὲ ἔθνη καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ, ἃ εἶδες τὰ δένδρα τὰ ξηρά . . . οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἁμαρτωλοὶ καήσονται ὅτι ἥμαρτον καὶ οὐ μετενόησαν. τὰ δὲ ἔθνη καήσονται ὅτι οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὸν κτίσαντα αὐτούς.
- 40 See *Sim.* 9,18,2: οἱ μὴ ἐγνωκότες θεὸν καὶ πονηρευόμενοι κεκριμένοι εἰσὶν εἰς θάνατον, οἱ δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἐγνωκότες . . . καὶ πονηρευόμενοι δις σὼς κολασθήσονται καὶ ἀποθανοῦνται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.
- 41 Cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 301 (on *Sim.* 4,4), who thinks that the issue is intransigence; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 167 (on *Sim.* 9,17–18): “those who, having recognized God, did not change their way of life accordingly”.

who do know God, but it is clear that both categories are condemned to death. Outsiders will not be saved, yet have until the last day a chance to change.⁴² It is clear that for Hermas one can only join the Christian community if one leaves behind one's former way of life and fully dedicates oneself to the church. In *Hermas* antagonism to the world outside is traceable.

3 Separation: Group Boundaries

Hermas sharply marks the boundaries between insiders and outsiders. Two patterns emerge: the author distances himself from the outside world and expects high levels of commitment and loyalty to the church.

3.1 *Worldly Affairs*

Hermas takes a relatively negative stance to the world outside.⁴³ He states, for example, in *Vis.* 1,1,8 that “those who consider evil things in their hearts draw upon themselves death and imprisonment, especially those who acquire this world and take pride in their wealth instead of focusing on the goods to come”.⁴⁴ In *Vis.* 4,3,4 the golden colour on the beast's head is explained as referring to “you who have fled from this world. For just as gold is tested by fire . . . you are tested by living among them [i.e., outsiders]”. According to *Sim.* 1, believers should realize that this world is like a foreign land, a city far away from their own city (v. 1). Instead of investing in any material means of this world (vv. 1–2, 4–5, 8), at least not more than is necessary to support oneself (v. 6), one should put one's money in supporting the needy (vv. 8–9) in anticipation of the

42 In *Vis.* 2,2,5 “the elect” (οἱ ἐκλεκτοί), “the righteous” (οἱ δίκαιοι) and “the holy ones” (οἱ ἅγιοι) are contrasted with “the outsiders” (τὰ ἔθνη). For the latter there is (a chance of) μετάνοια until the last day (τοῖς δὲ ἔθνεσιν μετάνοιά ἐστὶν ἕως ἐσχάτης ἡμέρας).

43 Cf. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 424, who argues that Hermas opposes the “secularization” (“Verweltlichung”) of the church, but at the same time expects believers to be active in the world (“Weltarbeitung”); SNYDER, *Shepherd*, p. 59, who thinks the issue to be that believers live “in a world of divided loyalties”; BROX, *Hirt*, p. 178: “Gefahr für den Glauben im Leben der Christen unter den Ungläubigen”; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 96, who, comparing *Vis.* 4,3,4 with *Sim.* 1, states that Hermas’ “rather negative, blanket description” of believers’ relation to outsiders in some passages is nuanced elsewhere.

44 According to DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 435; and BROX, *Hirt*, p. 84, the phrase “death and imprisonment” refers to retribution in the world to come. It should be noted, however, that, e.g., *Vis.* 2,3,1 and *Sim.* 6,3,4 imply that sinners are punished on earth. Cf. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 44 (on *Vis.* 1,1,8): “Those who have the wrong attitude, especially because of the distraction of wealth, bring their own (*spiritual*) prison with them” (italics mine).

world to come (v. 9). Spending money for social purposes is valued positively, but squandering like outsiders do (πολυτέλεια τῶν ἐθνῶν) by buying material goods negatively (v. 10). One should not busy oneself with worldly affairs, but with being part of the Christian community which proleptically represents the world to come.⁴⁵ Finally, in *Sim.* 5,3,6 it is stated that one should purify one's heart from all "vanities" (ματαίωματα) of the world. The present world is contingent.⁴⁶ Hermas' attitude towards the outside world is not so much characterized by hostility as by indifference.

All "pagan" practices mentioned in the text are valued negatively. In *Vis.* 1,4,2 the righteous are set against "outsiders" (ἔθνη) and "apostates", that is, against outsiders and those who make themselves like outsiders. Insiders are expected to refrain from outsiders' practices. In *Man.* 11,2,4, for example, consulting a soothsayer or false prophet is regarded as equal to "practicing divination like outsiders (ἔθνη) use to do" and idolatry.

Another "pagan" practice is banquet revelry. The catalogue of vices in *Man.* 6,2,5 includes "excesses of a lot of food, alcoholic drinks, tipsiness and various unnecessary carouses". The short catalogue in *Man.* 12,2,1 mentions "excesses . . . of ridiculously much food and alcoholic drinks and many other stupid carouses" and adds: "For every carouse is stupid and empty for God's servants".⁴⁷ These practices are not explicitly called "pagan", but Greco-Roman banquet scenes seem to lie in the background.⁴⁸ Apart from the extravagance, another aspect of such banquets is criticized. In *Vis.* 3,9 the haves are reprimanded for their lack of community spirit with regard to the distribution of food. The πρωτοκαθεδρία in v. 7 are probably community members who desire to have the best seats at meals.⁴⁹ In the Hellenistic world, social hierarchy was considered to be important at common meals.⁵⁰ Hermas seems to object to "pagan" extravagance and social hierarchy at community meals.

45 See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 158 n. 10, who argues that in *Sim.* 1 the church on earth represents the preferred, eschatological city.

46 See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 158.

47 In *Man.* 12,2,1 three evil desires are mentioned: desiring another (wo)man, excesses of wealth and carouses. Only the third is elaborated and further explained and, thus, emphasized.

48 There is no reason to presume that the background is specifically Roman, as OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 124, does. Banquets were customary throughout the Hellenistic world.

49 Cf. the term πρωτοκαθεδρία in Mark 12,39; Matt 23,6; and Luke 20,46, which is used in relation to synagogues and community meals (δεῖπνα). See further Chapter 8.

50 See, e.g., J. D'ARMS, *The Roman Convivium and the Idea of Equality*, in O. MURRAY (ed.), *Symptica: A Symposium on the Symposion*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1990, pp. 308–320; MAIER, *Social Setting*, pp. 103, 140–142 n. 113; M. KLINGHARDT, *Gemeinschaftsmahl*

In *Vis.* 3,6,2 it is stated that “those who have known the truth, but do not remain in it and do not continue to attach themselves to the holy ones”⁵¹ are not “useful”⁵² for the building of the tower. It has been argued that this refers to believers who join mystery cults.⁵³ This suggestion has been rejected by others in favour of an interpretation in terms of socio-economic responsibility, or heterodoxy.⁵⁴ It is difficult to decide between these three positions. In any case, it is stressed that believers should remain loyal to the community.

Man. 4,1,9 states that “anyone who does things similar to what outsiders do (τὰ ὁμοιώματα ποιῇ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν), commits adultery” and that one is to stay away from people who do such things because otherwise one is accessory to these sins. It has been suggested that τὰ ὁμοιώματα τοῖς ἔθνεσιν refers to mixed marriages.⁵⁵ It has further been argued that the context of marital chastity indicates that promiscuity or homosexual contacts are meant.⁵⁶ It is more likely, however, that committing adultery by doing things like outsiders do involves idolatry. In biblical literature adultery often refers to worshipping

und *Mahlgemeinschaft. Soziologie und Liturgie frühchristlicher Mahlfeiern* (TANZ, 13), Tübingen – Basel, Francke, 1996, pp. 75–83; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 81 n. 14.

- 51 *Vis.* 3,6,2: οἱ ἐγνωκότες τὴν ἀλήθειαν, μὴ ἐπιμένοντες δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ □μηδὲ κολλώμενοι τοῖς ἀγίοις. □ *txt* A and L¹, *om.* S Bo L² and E. The longer reading is accepted by WHITTAKER and EHRMAN, but not by LEUTZSCH. A. CARLINI, *La tradizione testuale del Pastore di Erma e i nuovi papiri*, in G. CAVALLO (ed.), *Le Strade del Testo*, Lecce, Adriatica Editrice, 1987, pp. 23–43, p. 31, argues that there is a tendency in A and L¹ to interpolate for further explanation. It could be added that the longer reading might have been influenced by similar expressions in esp. *Sim.* 8,8,1; 8,9,1; and 9,26,3. The longer reading in *Vis.* 3,6,2 fits the context somewhat awkwardly: this is used by OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 72 n. 30, as an argument against the longer reading, but it could be used also against the shorter reading. The shorter reading is easier and therefore probably secondary. The longer reading appears to be some kind of “afterthought” which is typical for Hermas.
- 52 For the terminology of “useful” versus “useless”, see, e.g., *Vis.* 3,5,5; 3,6,6–7; 4,3,4; *Sim.* 9,15,6; and 9,26,4 (ἐὺχρηστος); resp. *Vis.* 3,6,2(A L¹).7 and *Sim.* 9,26,4 (ἄχρηστος).
- 53 See DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 468, 470.
- 54 For the former, see esp. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 134 (on *Vis.* 3,6,2): “die soziale und ökonomische Integration in die heidnische gehobene Gesellschaft, die dann zur Konkurrenz und zum Übergewicht wurde, dem die Gemeinde vom Niveau wie dem des P[astor]H[ermae] nichts Attraktives entgegenzusetzen hatte”. See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 72. For the latter, see esp. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 74 (on *Vis.* 3,7,1): “Here even more than in 6.2 [i.e., *Vis.* 3,6,2], some form of heterodox belief or worship may be envisioned” (italics mine). See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 137 (on *Vis.* 3,7,1): “verschiedene Formen philosophischer, kultischer, synkretistischer Frömmigkeit”.
- 55 See esp. HENNE, *La pénitence*, p. 372 (with further refs.).
- 56 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 112. Cf. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 507, who rejects such views.

other gods.⁵⁷ Even if one keeps the precise meaning of the phrase open, it is clear that believers are expected to refrain from “pagan” practices and to separate themselves from anyone who does such things. In *Man.* 10,1,4 being “(over) involved in . . . friendships with outsiders (φιλίας ἐθνικαῖς) and many other things of this world” is valued negatively. In *Sim.* 8,9,1.3 cohering to the (community of) righteous (ἐκολλήθησαν τοῖς δικαίοις) is contrasted with “becoming more respected among outsiders” (γενόμενοι ἐνδοξότεροι παρὰ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν), “living together with outsiders” (μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνέζησαν/συνζώντες), “being counted among the outsiders (μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐλογίσθησαν)”, etc. Assimilation to outsiders is not only discouraged, but also denounced.⁵⁸

Contact with outsiders is, however, not completely rejected. Mission among outsiders is envisioned (e.g. *Vis.* 2,2,5). In this way believers are expected to be active in the world.⁵⁹ Furthermore, socio-economic relationships with outsiders are implied. In *Hermas* critique on overinvolvement in business affairs is a major theme, but wealth is valued positively because it comes from God and enables people to help the needy.⁶⁰ Participating in the socio-economic life in order to make money is not wrong. Being active in the world is, however, not necessarily an indication of a lesser degree of sectarianism. One can be in the world and yet not of it.⁶¹

3.2 Group Purity

Group discipline and a mechanism to exclude disobedient members are important characteristics of sectarian collectivities.⁶² Given the image of the purification of the tower by removing stones that are not useful, it seems obvious that *Hermas* believes that the purity of the community is to be maintained by excluding deviant members. Nonetheless, it has been argued that *Hermas*

57 See also DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 507; BROX, *Hirt*, p. 208; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 112 n. 17. See, e.g., Jer 5,7 LXX (ed. RAHLFS): “your sons have left me and have sworn to non-gods . . . they have committed adultery” (οἱ υἱοί σου ἐγκατέλιπόν με καὶ ὤμνουν ἐν τοῖς οὐκ οὖσιν θεοῖς . . . ἐμοιχῶντο).

58 See also, e.g., DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 537.

59 Cf. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 424, who sees the “Weltarbeitung” more in socio-economic terms, e.g., in the sense of earning money in order to be able to support the poor.

60 For the former, see esp. *Vis.* 1,3,1; 2,3,1; 3,6,5; 3,11,3; *Man.* 3,5; 5,2,2; 6,2,5; 10,1,4–5; *Sim.* 4,5–7; 8,8,1–2; 9,19,3; and 9,20,1–2. See also OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, *passim*. For the latter, esp. *Sim.* 1,9. See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 288; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 160.

61 See DJ. CHALCRAFT, *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances? Some Critical Sociological Reflections*, in ID., *Sectarianism*, pp. 2–23, p. 20 (no ref. to *Hermas*).

62 See B.R. WILSON, *The Social Dimensions of Sectarianism: Sects and New Religious Movements in Contemporary Society*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1990, p. 2.

does not envision “ecclesiastical excommunication”.⁶³ One of the key questions is whether the exclusion of the unuseful stones is merely eschatological,⁶⁴ or stands also for the purification of the contemporary church. The latter option seems to be best.

The building process of the tower stands most likely for the development of the church in the past, the present and the future. The foundations of the church were laid by pre-Christian generations of righteous people.⁶⁵ The rest of the structure consists of believers of whom some are dead and others still alive.⁶⁶ Eventually the church will be like a monolith.⁶⁷ The construction of the tower is a building project of past, present and future generations. It is unlikely that the rejection of stones would refer only to the future church. Some stones are excluded by not using them for the building at all; others are removed from the structure of the tower.⁶⁸ The former is to make sure that only those who are worth it become part of the community;⁶⁹ the latter that only those who live a virtuous life remain members of the community: sinners are thrown out of the house of God and need to change before they can possibly be reaccepted.⁷⁰ In both cases, (most of) the stones have the opportunity to change and to be (re)incorporated while the building process is still in progress.⁷¹ The purification of the church seems to be of past, present and future times.

63 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 75, but cf. p. 112 (see below).

64 *Ibid.*, p. 75.

65 See *Sim.* 9,15,4.

66 See esp. *Vis.* 3,5,1. Here the stones that go into the building of the tower represent apostles, bishops, teachers and deacons, some of whom have fallen asleep (οἱ μὲν κεκοιμημένοι) and some of whom are still alive (οἱ δὲ ἔτι ὄντες). So, certain people of past and present times are considered to be useful for the building of the tower. Pace DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 466, who thinks that οἱ δὲ ἔτι ὄντες does not mean that the people involved are still alive, but that their religious functions still exist in the church.

67 See *Vis.* 3,2,6; *Sim.* 9,9,7; and 9,18,3.

68 For the former, see, e.g., *Vis.* 3,2,7–9 and 5,5–7,6. For the latter, *Sim.* 9,6,3–5.

69 See esp. *Sim.* 8,2,5: the Shepherd tells Hermas that only “one who is worth it” (τις ἀξιός ἐστιν) is allowed to live in the building (*h.l.* “the walls”).

70 See esp. *Sim.* 9,13,9: stones that are thrown out of the house of God are contrasted with those that remain in the house of God (ἀπεβλήθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ . . . ἐμειναν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ θεοῦ).

71 See, e.g., *Vis.* 3,5,5; 6,6–7; *Sim.* 8,8,3; and 9,7,1–2.4–6. Cf. *Vis.* 3,7,2 and *Sim.* 8,6,4, where it is stated that for some sinners there is no salvation because they did not change. This indicates that this category of sinners did have a chance to change and to be saved, but did not take it. See also, e.g., OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 206–207: “it is not God who excludes them, but their own persistence in evil and refusal to be converted”.

A further question is whether Hermas envisions exclusion from the community for an unrepentant sinner, or some sort of “quarantine” within the community (for instance, exclusion from the Eucharist). Mostly, the rejection of stones involves that these are taken out of the building, which probably refers to exclusion.⁷² Sometimes they are placed in an inferior place within the building, in the middle of the tower or (with)in the walls.⁷³ This may refer to some kind of temporary quarantine within the community that anticipates or warns against the permanent inferior place where people will dwell who do not change on time.⁷⁴ Exclusion of unrepentant sinners from the community as well as breaking off of fellowship with erring brothers and sisters within the community seems to be implied.

Hermas’ aim is, however, not to exclude as many people as possible. *Man.* 8,10 states that believers who have gone astray should not be rejected but need to be encouraged to change their lives.⁷⁵ And the remark in *Man.* 4,1,8, that a

72 See esp. *Vis.* 3,5,5; *Sim.* 9,6,5; and 9,14,2; cf. 9,13,9 and 9,17,5. See also BROX, *Hirt*, esp. pp. 425–426. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, do not interpret these passages in terms of excommunication. But the phrase “they [i.e., the stones] were thrown out of the house of God” in *Sim.* 9,13,9 may well hint at some kind of exclusion of community members.

73 For the first, see *Vis.* 3,7,6 (ἐτέρῳ δὲ τόπῳ . . . πολὺ ἐλάττονι). For the second, *Sim.* 9,7,5 (εἰς μέσην τὴν οἰκοδομὴν). For the third, cf. *Sim.* 8,2,5; 8,7,3; and 8,8,3 (εἰς τὰ τεῖχη) with 8,6,6 (εἰς τὰ τεῖχη τὰ πρῶτα).

74 Pace DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, esp. p. 471; BROX, *Hirt*, esp. p. 141 (“der definitive Heilsort”); and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, esp. pp. 74–75, 202 n. 21, who do not interpret the above-mentioned passages in terms of some sort of quarantine in the contemporary church, but in terms of a permanent lesser place in the hereafter. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 75, argues against J. GROTZ, *Die Entwicklung des Bußstufenwesens in der vornicänischen Kirche*, Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 1955, pp. 20–23: “Nor does the text [*Vis.* 3,7,6] say anything about the practice of ecclesiastical excommunication”. Cf. B. POSCHMANN, *Paenitentia secunda. Die kirchliche Buße im ältesten Christentum bis Cyprian und Origenes* (Theoph., 1), Bonn, Hanstein, 1940, esp. p. 156 (“Zustand der Büßers, der . . . für die Aufnahme in den Turm noch nicht reif ist”); and K. RAHNER, *Schriften zur Theologie. XI. Frühe Bußgeschichte in Einzeluntersuchungen*, Zürich – Einsiedeln – Köln, Benziger, 1973, pp. 97–172, esp. p. 155 (“Verhältnis zur Kirche vor der definitiven und vollständigen Wiederaufnahme in die Kirche”), who interpret the inferior place as a temporary place of penance. A. D’ALÈS, *L’édit de Calliste. Études sur l’origine de la pénitence chrétienne*, Paris, Bauchesne, 1914, p. 62, thinks that the place of penitents in the narthex of the church is meant, but this may go too far. See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 75.

75 The list of virtues in *Man.* 8,10 includes “not to reject those who have gone astray in faith, but to make them turn around and to encourage them” (ἐσκανδαλισμένους ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως μὴ ἀποβάλλεσθαι, ἀλλ’ ἐπιστρέφειν καὶ εὐθύμους ποιεῖν). Cf. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 528: “Die ausdrückliche Erwähnung der Sorge für Gefährdete und Sünder . . . ist . . . hier mehr von der

sinner who changes should be reaccepted, may well refer to a general principle of reconciliation.⁷⁶

Hermas sees the church as a *corpus mixtum* where good and bad coexist until the last day. When the tall man inspects the tower during one of its final stages of construction, it turns out that, on further consideration, some stones are not useful for the building and need to be removed.⁷⁷ Only when the final stage of the building of the tower has been finished and the final inspection has taken place, the tower will reach perfection.⁷⁸ In the present world it is hard to see who are the just and who are the sinners.⁷⁹ The purification of the church will not reach perfection until the end of time. For Hermas, building up a renewed community by excluding deviant members is important.

4 Type of Sectarianism

The sectarian tendencies in *Hermas* raise the question what type of sectarianism is involved. Here Wilson's model of seven ideal types of sectarianism can

paränetischen Tradition als von den Leitgedanken des Buches bestimmt". But cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 235: "der Appell, denen nachzugeben bzw. diejenigen nicht in Verzweiflung geraten zu lassen, die sich von der Gemeinde getrennt haben, ist ein Dokument für Vorgänge und Konflikte innerhalb der Gemeinden der Zeit". A real issue in the contemporary church seems indeed to be referred to, but there is no reason to assume that "those who have gone astray" were believers who had left the community. For the latter, see esp. W. BAUER – K. ALAND – B. ALAND, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur*, Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 1988⁶, p. 1504: "ἑσκανδαλισμένοι H[ermas] ... 38, 10 [i.e., *Man.* 8,10] sind *Verleitete, Verführte*, aber noch nicht v. Glauben völlig Abgefallene".

76 See *Man.* 4,1,8: "one must take back the one who sinned, but changed" (δεῖ παραδεχθῆναι τὸν ἡμαρτηκότα καὶ μετανοοῦντα). Reacceptance of an adulterous but repentant partner is meant here, but a more general principle seems to be involved as well. See also BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 206–207; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 111. Pace DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 506.

77 See *Sim.* 9,6,4–5.

78 See esp. *Sim.* 9,9,6–7; 9,10,4; and 9,18,2–4, which are a "preview" of the eschatological church. See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, esp. p. 225 (on *Sim.* 9,9,7): "Before returning to the harsh reality of the historical, imperfect church, the eschatological vision of the completed tower, the perfect church, can be briefly enjoyed". Cf. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, esp. p. 615 (on *ibid.*): "Die Einheit und Makellosigkeit der nun wieder der idealen gleichenden empirischen Kirche"; and BROX, *Hirt*, esp. p. 404 (on *ibid.*): "Die Kirche ist infolge des Bußwerks nun von idealer Qualität und Zusammensetzung".

79 See esp. *Sim.* 3,3 (and also v. 2): "in this world neither the just nor the sinners are recognizable, but all look the same" (ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ οὐ φαίνονται οὔτε οἱ δίκαιοι οὔτε οἱ ἁμαρτωλοί, ἀλλὰ πάντες ὅμοιοι εἰσιν). See also BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 298–299; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 165.

be helpful, though it is not intended to force *Hermas* into it. Wilson distinguishes seven types:⁸⁰

1. *Conversionist*
God will change people. Conversionists seek a transformed self: humans are corrupt and a change of heart is necessary in order to be saved.
2. *Revolutionist*
God will overturn the present world. Revolutionists seek a transformed world: only destruction of the world will suffice to save people. Although this is seen as the work of God, believers may feel themselves called upon to participate in the process.
3. *Introversionist*
God calls people to withdraw from the world. Introversionists seek a purified community. Salvation can only be attained by the fullest possible withdrawal from the wider society.
4. *Manipulationist*
God calls people to change their subjective orientation or perception. Manipulationists seek a transformed set of relationships, a transformed method of coping with evil. People must learn the right means of living in the world. Salvation is neither other-worldly nor transcendental, but is possible in this world: one seeks to be saved from illness, poverty, etc.
5. *Thaumaturgical*
God will work specific miracles. People must individually call on divine or magical powers.
6. *Reformist*
God calls people to gradually reform the world, with God's help.
7. *Utopian*
God calls people to completely change society, with God's help. The main difference with the revolutionist response is that it is humans who remake the world. And the main difference with the reformist response is that it is more radical, because it seeks the complete replacement of the social order.

80 The scheme is a summary of the views found in WILSON, *Magic and the Millennium*, pp. 18–30.

Hermas does not seek to change the world (cf. the revolutionist, reformist and utopian types), but the church. He seeks a purified community (introversionist) through the change of its members (conversionist). Change which leads to salvation is not reached by calling on divine or magical powers (thaumaturgical), but by a change of life (μετάνοια). Salvation is not this-worldly (manipulationist). For *Hermas* the conversionist or introversionist types of sectarianism seem to fit best, though a difference with the introversionist stance is that Hermas does not call for a rigorous withdrawal from the world or an insulation of the community.

Concluding Remarks

Hermas shows sectarian tendencies. The community is thought of as exclusive and elect (*Vis.* 1,3,4) and in tension with the outside world.

In terms of the model of Stark and Bainbridge, deviant norms in *Hermas* include the valuing of “spiritual marriage” and mistrust of “normal” marriage (*Vis.* 2,2,3; *Man.* 4,1,5–10; and 4,4,2), which challenge the conventional family and go against society’s common pattern (“difference”). Community members are set against “outsiders” (ἔθνη) who will not be saved (esp. *Vis.* 3,6,1; “antagonism”). Hermas marks the boundaries between insiders and outsiders (“separation”). He expects believers to distance themselves from the world (*Man.* 4,1,9; 10,1,4; and 11,2,4) and to be committed to the group (*Vis.* 3,6,2 and *Sim.* 8,9,1,3). The purity of the community is to be maintained by breaking off of fellowship with deviant members (*Man.* 4,1,9), or by excluding them from the community (*Vis.* 3,5,5; *Sim.* 9,13,9; and 9,14,2). Nonetheless, the emphasis is not on exclusion, but on reconciliation (*Man.* 4,1,8 and 8,10). Moreover, the community is seen as a mixed body which on its way to perfection incorporates both true and untrue believers (*Sim.* 3,2–3; 9,6,4–5; 9,9,6–7; 9,10,4; and 9,18,2–4). Mission among outsiders is envisioned (*Vis.* 3,5,4; 3,7,3; *Sim.* 8,3,2; and 9,17,1–4) and community members are allowed to have socio-economical relationships with outsiders (cf. *Sim.* 1,9). Being active in the world for the sake of mission or for socio-economic reasons is, however, no indication of a lesser degree of sectarianism.

In terms of Wilson’s model, the type of sectarianism in *Hermas* is a combination of a conversionist and an introversionist stance: Hermas seeks the purification of the church by the conversion of its members (esp. *Vis.* 3 and *Sim.* 9), who are expected to distance themselves from the ways of the world (*Vis.* 1,1,8; 4,3,4; and *Sim.* 5,3,6).

The Roman Empire

In the literature on “early Christianity and the Roman Empire”, *Hermas* is often left aside.¹ In the literature on *Hermas*, the author’s views on the empire have not received ample treatment.² This topic is not the same as that of *Hermas*’ views on the outside world. In contrast with the previous chapter, the focus will now be on *Hermas*’ attitude towards the authorities. Living in or near the centre of Roman political power, *Hermas*’ community must have experienced the impact of the empire on many aspects of social, economic and political life. It will be asked to what extent there are connections or tensions between *Hermas* and the claims of the Roman imperial order.

-
- 1 For instance, in M. LABAHN – J. ZANGENBERG (eds.), *Zwischen den Reichen. Neues Testament und Römische Herrschaft. Vorträge auf der Ersten Konferenz der European Association for Biblical Studies* (TANZ, 36), Tübingen – Basel, Francke, 2002, there are several references to the *Apostolic Fathers* (1 Clem.; Did.; Diogn.; and Polycarp, Phil.), but not to *Hermas*. M. MEISER, *Das Christentum in Rom im Spiegel des Ersten Clemensbriefes*, in J. ZANGENBERG – M. LABAHN (eds.), *Christians as a Religious Minority in a Multicultural City: Modes of Interaction and Identity Formation in Early Imperial Rome. Studies on the Basis of a Seminar at the Second Conference of the European Association for Biblical Studies (EABS) from July 8–12, 2001, in Rome* (JSNTS, 243), London – New York, T&T Clark, 2004, pp. 139–156, refers to *Hermas* several times (as the only author of the volume), but does not deal with *Hermas*’ relation to the Roman Empire. Other examples include, e.g., A. BRENT, *The Imperial Cult and the Development of Church Order. Concepts and Images of Authority in Paganism and Early Christianity before the Age of Cyprian* (SVigChr, 45), Leiden, Brill, 1999, who refers to *Hermas*, but does not comment on its views on the imperial cult; and A.M. RITTER, “Kirche und Staat” im Denken des frühen Christentums. *Texte und Kommentare zum Thema Religion und Politik in der Antike* (TC, 13), Bern, Peter Lang, 2005, who does not refer to *Hermas* at all. An earlier version of this chapter was published as M. GRUNDEKEN, *The Shepherd of Hermas and the Roman Empire*, in M. LABAHN – O. LEHTIPUU (eds.), *People under Power: Early Jewish and Christian Responses to the Roman Empire* (Early Christianity in the Roman World), Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 2015, pp. 189–205. I thank Amsterdam University Press for permission to include the article here.
 - 2 The topic is dealt with in the commentaries on *Hermas*, but the focus is mostly not on the empire, but on the outside world. See, e.g., M. LEUTZSCH, *Gemeinde und Gesellschaft. Die Wahrnehmung des Nichtchristlichen im “Hirten des Hermas”*, in ID., *Wahrnehmung*, pp. 192–214, whose interpretation of *Sim.* 1 focuses on *Hermas*’ views on non-Christians.

1 *Hermas and the Authorities*

1.1 *Similitude 1*

A key passage is *Sim.* 1. According to this *Similitude*, God's servants live in the present world as if in a foreign place with its own lord and its own laws (vv. 1, 3–4). They are expected to turn their minds towards their own city with its supreme Lord and superior laws (vv. 1–2, 5). This does not mean that they are to disregard or disobey the authorities. It is emphasized that the lord of the world in which they live rightly (δικαίως) expects them to obey to his laws (v. 4). After all, God placed his creation under human dominion (*Man.* 12,4,2). Yet, if believers get into conflict with the authorities, they should leave the land (*Sim.* 1,5–6). For this reason, they are urged to arrange no more for themselves than what is necessary to sustain themselves so that they are always ready to leave (v. 6). Believers who deny the law of the heavenly city will eventually not enter it (v. 5). They owe the greatest allegiance to the heavenly city, represented now by the Christian community.³ Being obedient to God is more important than obeying the authorities.

It cannot be taken for granted that *Sim.* 1 refers to a specific Roman context.⁴ It has been argued that the city (vv. 1–3 and 5–6) is Rome.⁵ But the place where believers live is not only designated as “city” (πόλις, vv. 1–3 and 5–6), but also as “land” (χώρα, v. 4) and “a foreign place” (ξένη, vv. 1 and 6). Most likely, the present world in general is meant.

The “lord of this city” (v. 3), “lord of this land” (v. 4), or “master of this city” (v. 6) has been identified with various Roman emperors, or with the devil.⁶ There is no evidence, however, that a particular Roman emperor is meant.⁷ Moreover, in the context the devil is not mentioned.⁸ The lord or master

3 See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 158 with n. 10.

4 See esp. JOLY, *Hermas*, pp. 210–211 n. 2, 432–433, who comments that such an interpretation is “not forbidden”, but that a more “allegorical” interpretation is to be preferred.

5 See, e.g., ZAHN, *Hirt*, pp. 121–124.

6 For the former, see, e.g., ZAHN, *Hirt*, p. 125 (Domitian); HAHNEMAN, *Muratorian Fragment*, p. 41 (Domitian or Trajan); and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 158: “it is not totally out of the question that memories of clashes between Roman Jews and the government under Tiberius and Claudius are invoked”. (Osiek’s formulation is somewhat overnuanced: is anything ever totally out of the question?). For the latter, see, e.g., DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 551; JOLY, *Hermas*, p. 210 n. 2; and BROX, *Hirt*, p. 286.

7 See also, e.g., DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 551: “eine genaue Deutung [ist] weder nötig noch möglich. Wenn der Verf. [Verfasser] auf eine solche Wert legen würde, hätte er sicher den Hermas danach fragen und den Engel darauf antworten lassen”.

8 Cf. the use of διάβολος in *Man.* 4,3,4,6; 5,1,3; 7,2–3; 9,9,11; 11,3,17; 12,2,2; 12,4,6–7; 12,5,1–2,4; 12,6,1–2,4; and *Sim.* 8,3,6.

probably represents the authorities in general. The point that is made is that “all things are strange and are under the power of *someone else* (ὕπ’ ἐξουσίαν ἑτέρου)” (v. 3).

The law(s) of the city (vv. 3–4, 6) have been interpreted as the local (or Roman) laws, as the “commandments of the devil” (*Man.* 12,4,6–7), or as guiding principles.⁹ But the laws are not associated with the Roman laws (see esp. v. 3). The laws are not devilish either.¹⁰ As a matter of fact, it is stated that the lord of the land rightly expects his subjects to obey to his laws (v. 4). Νόμος involves more than some general principles: the laws are those of the lord (vv. 3–4, 6) and of the city (v. 5). Most likely, the laws of society are meant.

Finally, the change of place, from the present city to the “own” city, does not necessarily imply any clashes between believers and the Roman authorities. The perspective is partly eschatological. God’s servants “will live in” (v. 1), or “return to” (vv. 2, 5, 9) their own city, but if they deny their own law and follow the law of the present city, they “will not be accepted” to (οὐ μὴ παραδεχθήσῃ) and “will be excluded from” (ἐκκληισθήσῃ ἅπ’) their city (v. 5). In other parts of the *Similitude* the perspective is different. It is stated that the lord of this city may summon his citizens to “move out of” (ἐξελθε ἐκ, v. 3) his city, or “to leave” (ἐκχώρει, v. 4) his land. They may even be “thrown out by him” (ἐκβαλλόμενος ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ, v. 4). For this reason, one should always be ready to leave, “so that, when the lord of this city wishes to throw you out (ἐκβαλεῖν) as opponent to his law, you will leave (ἐξέλθῃς) his city and go to (ἀπέλθῃς) your own city” (v. 6). The question is what is meant by this change of place. It has been argued that it refers to death or martyrdom,¹¹ to expulsion,¹² or to distancing oneself from society.¹³ Clashes or persecutions do not seem to be implied.¹⁴ It is stated that the lord of the land rightly expects his subjects to obey to him. Active

9 For the first, see, e.g., ZAHN, *Hirt*, p. 124 (Roman laws); and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 159. For the second, BROX, *Hirt*, p. 286. For the third, DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 551.

10 OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 159, who rejects Brox’s interpretation, does not explicitly use *Sim.* 1,6 to substantiate her argument, but rightly remarks: “Hermas is more optimistic about the presence of God’s spirit in the world and in Christians than to imply here that the devil controls the world”.

11 See, e.g., JOLY, *Hermas*, p. 210; and LEUTZSCH, *Wahrnehmung*, p. 202.

12 See, e.g., ZAHN, *Hirt*, pp. 124–125 (martyrdom or expulsion); and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 159.

13 See esp. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 552: “paktiere mit der Welt, oder trenne dich von ihr”; and BROX, *Hirt*, p. 287: “Beendigung bzw. Anfang einer Zugehörigkeit bzw. . . . Übergang von der einen Zugehörigkeit zur anderen.”

14 See also, e.g., DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 552: “Es ist . . . gar nicht ausgemacht, daß der Verf. [Verfasser] hier immer oder zunächst an Zusammenstöße mit dem Staat denkt . . . Die Gefahr für die Christen besteht ja nach 4 [*Sim.* 1.4] nicht in Feigheit während der Verfolgung, sondern in allzu engem Zusammenhang mit der Welt.”

resistance does not seem to be envisioned. Hermas' point is that material possessions make God's servants vulnerable for making too many concessions to the established order. Moving from this city to the "own" city means passive dissidence. Being loyal to the Lord of the heavenly city is more important than being loyal to the authorities on earth.

There is no sign that *Sim.* 1 is to be interpreted from a specific historical background. Furthermore, its meaning is not dependent on its possible historical setting. The issue concerns the relation between believers and the authorities on earth (whatever authorities these may be). It is reasonable to assume that the overall setting is that of the Roman Empire, but details about the exact historical background are not given.

1.2 *A Comparison with Some Other Early Christian Writings*

A question that arises is where Hermas stands in comparison to the various attitudes towards the authorities in other early Christian writings. First there is Hermas' stance on the relation between the power of God and that of the authorities. In the New Testament the evangelists contrast the reign of God (or Jesus) with that of the emperor (Matt 22,21; Mark 12,17; Luke 20,25; and John 18,36). This contrast is generally understood in a dualistic and apologetic way. The two reigns would be portrayed as two powers that exist side by side. This would allow Christians to present themselves as citizens of two worlds and not as enemies of the authorities.¹⁵ Others reject a dualistic and apologetic reading and argue that the power of the emperor is understood as subordinate to the supreme power of the Lord who rules both reigns.¹⁶ It seems that Hermas' attitude is a combination of the two positions: believers are expected to be loyal to their authorities and, in conflicting situations, to obey God more than humans.

Second there is Hermas' position in the spectrum varying from submission to revolution. At the one end of the spectrum are, for instance, 1 Peter and Titus. It has been argued that 1 Pet 2–3 and Tit 3,1 call for submissiveness to the

15 See, e.g. B.A. MASTIN, *The Imperial Cult and the Ascription of the Title Θεός to Jesus* (John xx.28), in *StEv* 6 = TU 112 (1979) 352–365, p. 363; and H.C. BRENNECKE, 'An fidelis ad militiam converti possit?' [*Tertullian, de idolatria* 19,1], *Frühchristliches Bekenntnis und Militärdienst im Widerspruch?*, in D. WYRWA – B. ALAND – C. SCHÄUBLIN (eds.), *Die Weltlichkeit des Glaubens in der Alten Kirche. Fs Ulrich Wickert* (BZNW, 85), Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 1997, pp. 45–100, p. 50.

16 See, e.g. W.A. MEEKS, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (NT.S, 14), Leiden, Brill, 1967, p. 64; R. PESCH, *Das Markusevangelium. 11. Kommentar zu Kap. 8,27–16,20* (HThK, 2), Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 1977, pp. 227–228; and L.B. RICHEY, *Roman Imperial Ideology and the Gospel of John* (CBQMS, 43), Washington, DC, Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2007, pp. 157–166.

authorities.¹⁷ This does not count for *Hermas*. For *Hermas*, God's servants are sovereign to the authorities,¹⁸ yet are to face the reality of everyday life. As long as their obligations to the authorities are not in conflict with their obligations to God, there is no problem. If a conflict occurs, they are to choose for God, but they should not enter into a conflict with the establishment. Obedience is to a certain extent based on free choice.¹⁹ *Hermas'* attitude may be summarized as conditional, critical obedience. The example of *Hermas* shows that such an attitude is not to be regarded as anachronistic in early Christianity.²⁰ *Hermas'* attitude resembles that of Justin Martyr. According to Justin, believers (should) acknowledge the kings and rulers of the earth, worship God alone, and rely on the Last Judgement when the authorities do not pay regard to them.²¹

-
- 17 See L. THURÉN, *Jeremiah 27 and Civil Obedience in 1 Peter*, in LABAHN – ZANGENBERG (eds.), *Zwischen den Reichen*, pp. 215–228, p. 215 with n. 1.226. In 1 *Clem.* 60,2–61,2 there is a prayer for the authorities on earth and it is expected that Christians submit themselves to them because God has given them the power to rule. See also MEISER, *Christentum in Rom*, pp. 143 n. 24, 154, who rejects the thesis of T. SCHMITT, *Paroikie und Oikoumene. Sozial- und mentalitätsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum 1. Clemensbrief* (BZNW, 110), Berlin, de Gruyter, 2002, pp. 40–60, that 1 *Clem.* 60–61 would not be about the (political) authorities, but about church leaders.
- 18 A similar conclusion concerning *Sim.* 1,1 is reached by E. PLÜMACHER, *Identitätsverlust und Identitätsgewinn. Studien zum Verhältnis von kaiserzeitlicher Stadt und frühem Christentum* (BThSt, 11), Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1987, p. 46: “die Quelle der neuen Identität lag nun weit außerhalb des Polishorizonts: ἡ γὰρ πόλις ὑμῶν μακράν ἐστιν ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ταύτης, heißt es im Pastor Hermae... Wer hier heimisch wurde, war von allem Fixiertsein auf die Polis frei und hatte... für das, was in der Polis von jedermann sonst bewundert wurde, nur noch souveräne Verachtung übrig”. Plümacher does not go more deeply into *Hermas'* views on the relation between believers and the authorities, or on the identity of the church in relation to imperial Rome.
- 19 N. BROX, *Der erste Petrusbrief* (EKK, 21), Zürich – Einsiedeln – Köln, Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1979, p. 124, argues something similar for 1 *Pet.*
- 20 Pace THURÉN, *Jeremiah 27*, pp. 223–224.
- 21 Justin Martyr, 1 *Apol.* 17,3–4 (ed. and trans. MINNS – PARVIS), explains the saying “give to Caesar what is Caesar's and to God what is God's” as follows: “Whence, while we worship only God we serve you joyfully in other respects, acknowledging you as kings and rulers within the human sphere and we pray that you are found to have prudent discernment along with the kingly power. And if you take no heed of our praying and putting everything in the open we will not be harmed at all; but rather we believe and have been convinced that each of you will pay penalties in eternal fire according to the worth of his actions” (ὅθεν θεὸν μὲν μόνον προσκυνούμεν, ὑμῖν δὲ πρὸς τὰ ἄλλα χαίροντες ὑπηρετοῦμεν, βασιλεῖς καὶ ἄρχοντας ἀνθρώπων ὁμολογοῦντες καὶ εὐχόμενοι μετὰ τῆς βασιλικῆς δυνάμεως καὶ σώφρονα τὸν λογισμὸν ἔχοντας ὑμᾶς εὐρεθῆναι. εἰ δὲ καὶ ἡμῶν εὐχομένων καὶ πάντα εἰς φανερόν

At the other end of the spectrum stands, for example, the book of Revelation. It has been contended that this writing is almost a call to revolution.²² Hermas does not call to subvert or even to change the status quo. Moreover, in *Hermas* the “beast” does not stand for the worshipped emperor.²³ Hermas’ attitude towards the authorities is not so much characterized by hostility as by indifference.

1.3 *Pragmatism and Realism*

Hermas’ critical stance towards the authorities is quite moderate. Perhaps the author is somewhat reticent. It will be asked whether Hermas’ stance is a tactical move, or due to more pragmatic reasons.

A first explanation for Hermas’ moderate views may be that he fears persecution. In *Vis.* 3,1,9 the woman church does not allow Hermas to sit on her right side and explains to him that this side is for those who have already been approved by God, namely those who have suffered for the name of the Lord.²⁴ When Hermas asks her what they have endured, she answers: “whips, prisons, severe torments, crosses and wild animals”.²⁵ The fact that Hermas asks for further explanation seems to indicate that his addressees are not entirely familiar with these forms of severe persecution.²⁶ Yet, the threat of persecutions

τιθέντων ἀφροντιστήσετε, οὐδὲν ἡμεῖς βλαβησόμεθα, πιστεύοντες μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ πεπεισμένοι κατ’ ἀξίαν τῶν πράξεων ἕκαστον πίσειν διὰ πυρὸς αἰωνίου δίκας).

- 22 See, e.g., A.Y. COLLINS, *Persecution and Vengeance in the Book of Revelation*, in D. HELMHOLM (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1983, pp. 729–749, p. 749: “Revelation’s call for vengeance and the possibility of the book’s function as an outlet for envy give the book a tremendous potential for real psychological and social evil . . . Revelation limits vengeance and envy to the imagination and clearly rules out violent deeds”. Cf. H.J. DE JONGE, *The Apocalypse of John and the Imperial Cult*, in H.F.J. HORSTMANSHOFF – H.W. SINGOR – F. VAN STRATEN – J.H.M. STRUBBE (eds.), *Kykeon: Studies in Honour of H.S. Versnel* (RGRW, 142), Leiden, Brill, 2002, pp. 127–41, who argues that Revelation fulminates against the emperor cult and is strongly opposed to the Roman authorities, but does not call to revolution.
- 23 For the interpretation of the beast in Revelation, see, e.g., B.J. LIETAERT PEERBOLTE, *To Worship the Beast: The Revelation of John and the Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, in LABAHN – ZANGENBERG (eds.), *Zwischen den Reichen*, pp. 239–259.
- 24 Probably the name of God is meant, see also, e.g., *Sim.* 9,28,6. See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 115. Pace DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 457.
- 25 See *Vis.* 3,2,1: ὑπήνεγκαν [. . .] μάστιγας, φυλακάς, θλίψεις μεγάλας, σταυρούς, θηρία.
- 26 OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 22, states: “There is some reference to suffering and possible persecution, which should not be understood as the present situation of the community, but as a collective memory and eschatological forewarning”. Cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 473: “Christenverfolgung und Martyrium sind für die Kirche des H[ermas] zweifellos

appears to be an actuality. The warning that “tribulation” (θλίψις) will come may well refer to this threat.²⁷ Moreover, the right side where Hermas is not

geläufig und aktuell”; and p. 474: “Die Aktualität von Verfolgungen ist also sicher”. Cf. also S. FUHRMANN, *Leben verlieren und Leben finden. Nachfolge und Martyrium in den Evangelien*, in ID. – R. GRUNDMANN (eds.), *Martyriumsvorstellungen in Antike und Mittelalter. Leben oder sterben für Gott?* (AGJU, 80), Leiden, Brill, 2012, pp. 167–189, p. 175: “Hier [i.e., in Mark 10,38–41] ist eine deutliche Reserve gegenüber dem Martyrium als verdienstvollem Handeln festzustellen, anders als beispielsweise ... im Hirt des Hermas (bes. Herm [v] 3,1,9)”.

- 27 In *Hermas* θλίψις is used in different ways. Cf. BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 471–476, who thinks it refers to personal trouble (*Vis.* 2,3,1; *Sim.* 6,2,5–6,3,6; and 7,1–7), the end time catastrophe (*Vis.* 2,2,7; 4,1,1; 4,2,5; and 4,3,6) and persecution (*Vis.* 1,3,4; 1,4,2; 2,2,2,8; 2,3,4; 3,1,9–3,2,2; 3,5,2; 3,6,5; *Sim.* 6,3,4,6; 6,5,4,6; 8,1,18–8,2,4; 8,3,6–7; 8,6,4; 8,8,4; 8,9,3; 9,19,1,3; 9,21,3; 9,26,3–8; and 9,28,1–7).

In some passages it refers to persecutions. See *Vis.* 2,2,7 (pace BROX, *Hirt*, p. 472)—“happy are you who endure the coming great tribulation” (μακάριοι ὑμεῖς ὅσοι ὑπομένετε τὴν θλίψιν τὴν ἐρχομένην τὴν μεγάλην): θλίψις relates to denying the Lord (“those who deny their Lord”, τοὺς ἀρνησαμένους τὸν κύριον αὐτῶν, v. 8); 2,3,4—“Say to Maximus: See, tribulation is coming: deny again, if it seems (good) to you” (ἐρεῖς δὲ Μαξίμω· Ἴδού θλίψις ἔρχεται· ἐάν σοι φανῇ, πάλιν ἄρνησαι); 3,2,1—“whips, prisons, severe torments (θλίψεις μεγάλας), crosses and wild animals”; 3,6,5—“when tribulation comes ... they [the rich] deny their Lord” (ὅταν δὲ γένῃται θλίψις ... ἀπαρνοῦνται τὸν κύριον αὐτῶν); *Sim.* 8,3,7—“those who have been tormented (θλιβέντες) because of the law, but have not suffered and have not denied their law”; and 9,21,3—“doubters, when they hear of persecution (θλίψιν), commit idolatry because of their cowardice and because they are ashamed of the name of their Lord”.

In other passages, θλίψις refers to personal trouble. See *Vis.* 2,3,1—“you, Hermas, have great personal trouble” (σὺ δὲ, Ἑρμᾶ, μεγάλας θλίψεις ἔσχες ιδιωτικάς); *Man.* 2,5—“those who have taken while they were in trouble” (οἱ ... λαμβάνοντες θλιβόμενοι); 8,10—the catalogue of virtues includes “not to trouble (μὴ θλίβειν) debtors”, that is, not to put pressure on them; *Sim.* 1,8—“buy suffering souls (ψυχὰς θλιβομένης)”, with widows and orphans as example; 6,3,6—“when they are tormented by every torment” (ὅταν οὖν θλιβῶσι πάσῃ θλίψει), which includes illness; 7—Hermas is as head of his household “tormented” by the angel of punishment (θλίβει, v. 1; θλιβῆναι, vv. 1–3,5; θλιβῆς, v. 3; θλιβομένου, v. 3; θλίψιν, vv. 5–6; θλίψη, v. 6; θλιβήση, v. 6; θλίψις, v. 7), so that perpetrators are “tormented” through him (θλιβῆναι, v. 3; θλιβήσονται, v. 3; θλίψιν ... ἔχειν, v. 3); Hermas and his house are tormented (θλιβῆναι, v. 5); and sinners who changed are to be “tormented with many and all sorts of torments” (θλιβῆναι πολλαῖς θλίψεσι καὶ ποικίλαις, v. 4; see also v. 4, θλίψεις; and v. 7, θλίψις); and *Sim.* 8,10,4, where θλίβονται refers to experiencing personal trouble.

Finally, in *Vis.* 4, Hermas’ vision of the beast “as a type of the coming tribulation” (εἰς τύπον τῆς θλίψεως τῆς ἐπερχομένης, 4,1,2; τύπος ἐστὶν θλίψεως τῆς μελλούσης τῆς μεγάλης, 4,2,5; τύπον τῆς θλίψεως τῆς ἐρχομένης μεγάλης, 4,3,6), as “a great tribulation” which Hermas manages to escape (μεγάλῃν θλίψιν, 4,2,4) and which all God’s elect can escape if they are changed (4,2,5; 4,3,6), θλίψις has eschatological connotations but its exact meaning

allowed to sit is reserved not only for those who suffered in the past, but for “anyone who suffers for the name”.²⁸ The wording indicates that the suffering is not just a past remembrance, but an actual situation. For Hermas, severe persecutions seem to belong to the past, but not oppression of or possible violence against believers.

A second explanation for Hermas’ relatively moderate views on the authorities may be that he values relations with the political system for economic reasons. Critique on overinvolvement in business affairs is an important issue in *Hermas*, but making money is in itself not denounced, because wealth enables people to help the needy.²⁹ In order to make money, one needs to participate in the socio-economic system. Within this setting, it is advantageous to appear as loyal citizens.

remains uncertain. Pace M. FRENCHKOWSKI, *Visionen als Imagination. Beobachtungen zum differenzierten Wirklichkeitsanspruch frühchristlicher Visionsliteratur*, in N. HÖMKE – M. BAUMBACH (eds.), *Fremde Wirklichkeiten. Literarische Phantastik und antike Literatur* (Kalliope, 6), Heidelberg, Winter, 2006, pp. 339–366, p. 351: “Erst in einem zweiten Schritt wird die Begegnung [i.e., with the monster] zur Allegorie für die bevorstehende Christenverfolgung”.

There is no sufficient evidence to link the (threat) of persecutions with those by a particular Roman emperor. See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 474: “die Angaben des P[astor]H[ermae] bleiben absolut vage und unzureichend, wenn man aus ihnen bestimmtere Auskünfte über historische Daten gewinnen will”. Pace, e.g., ZAHN, *Hirt*, pp. 118–136 (Hermas refers to persecutions under Domitian, yet was written during the reign of Nerva); DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 422; SNYDER, *Shepherd*, pp. 20–21, 24; and LAMPE, *Die stadtrömischen Christen*, p. 188 (Trajan); HILHORST, *Hermas*, p. 689 (Trajan and Hadrian); K. BAUS, *Von der Urgemeinde zur frühchristlichen Großkirche* (HKG[J], 1), Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 1965³, p. 161 (Antoninus Pius); and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 94–95 (Nero).

Cf. S.R. GARRETT, *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings*, Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 1989, pp. 105, 131 n. 26 (on *Vis.* 4.1,5–9), who suggests that the coming tribulation refers to the power of the demonic.

Cf. also E. PETERSON, *Die Begegnung mit dem Ungeheuer. Hermas, Visio IV*, in *VigChr* 8 (1954) 52–71; rev. in ID., *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis*, pp. 285–309; and A.P. O’HAGAN, *The Great Tribulation to Come in the Pastor of Hermas*, in *StPatr* 4 = TU 79 (1961) 305–311, p. 307, who both take ἑλῑψις as referring to Gehinnom (“hell” or “purgatory”). The great tribulation may have an eschatological dimension, yet seems to be this-worldly. See esp. R.J. BAUCKHAM, *The Great Tribulation in the Shepherd of Hermas*, in *JThS* 25 (1974) 27–40, p. 32, who interprets “the coming great tribulation” as “an impending persecution which he [i.e., Hermas] understands as part of a larger eschatological event”.

28 See *Vis.* 3.1,2: δὲ ἐὰν πάθῃ διὰ τὸ ὄνομα.

29 See *Sim.* 1,9.

A third explanation may be that Hermas does not want to put off people for missionary reasons.³⁰ Hermas envisions mission among outsiders.³¹ Social interactions with outsiders might ask for compromises with the establishment.

Each of these three explanations suggests that Hermas' moderate views may be a tactical move aiming at good or at least neutral relations with the authorities in favour of the church.³² There are two major problems with this line of reasoning. First, Hermas does not appear to be very anxious. He quite explicitly states that God's servants should not be too submissive to the authorities. In *Vis.* 2,3,4, for instance, he writes: "Say to Maximus: See, tribulation (θλίψις) is coming; deny again (πάλιν ἄρνησαι), if it seems good to you". Maximus is here probably rebuked for having denied his faith in fear of oppression or persecution.³³ Furthermore, if Hermas really wants to be careful, why then does he dare to challenge the veneration of the emperor (see the next section)? Second, in the Roman Empire criticizing the authorities and being a loyal citizen were not per se regarded as mutually exclusive. A well-known example is Seneca, who ridiculed emperor Claudius.³⁴ Hermas perhaps does not want his work or his community to come across as anti-Roman, but instead of a tactical reason there may well have been other reasons for him not to reject the status quo. One option is that the author is not interested in politics. Another possibility is that he agrees with Rome. A more likely reason, however, is that for the author, who belongs to a small Christian minority and to the lower social classes of society, any revolutionary ideas are out of the question.

30 For this motif, see, e.g., W.G. KÜMMEL, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Heidelberg, Quelle & Meyer, 1973¹⁷, p. 131, who argues something similar for Acts 25,8.

31 See *Vis.* 3,5,4; 3,7,3; *Sim.* 8,3,2; and 9,17,1–4.

32 For this motif in relation to early Christianity, see, e.g., W. SCHRAGE, *Ethik des Neuen Testaments* (GNT, 4), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982⁴, p. 13; and J. ECKERT, *Das Imperium Romanum im Neuen Testament. Ein Beitrag zum Thema 'Kirche und Gesellschaft'*, in *TThZ* 96 (1987) 253–271, p. 266.

33 See DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 450: "einer, der in der Verfolgungszeit durch Verleugnung einen schweren Anstoß gegeben hatte"; and BROX, *Hirt*, p. 103. Less clear is OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 57.

34 See L.A. Seneca, *Apoc.* 8,3 (ed. LUND): "he wants to become a god: is he not satisfied that he has a temple in Britain, that the barbarians worship him and consider him to be a god...?" (*deus fieri vult: parum est quod templum in Britannia habet, quod <hunc> nunc barbari colunt et ut deum orant...?*).

2 *Hermas and the Emperor Cult*

In *Hermas* the emperor cult is not explicitly mentioned. Nevertheless, there are some indications that the veneration of the emperor is rejected.

2.1 *God's Supreme Power*

For *Hermas*, imperial power is subordinate to the power of God. God has all power.³⁵ God is the Almighty.³⁶ God has even power over the devil, who has no power of his own.³⁷ Creation is sustained by God's Son.³⁸ God's power is superior to all other dominions. Recognizing only God (or his Son) as Lord by definition delimits the divinity and authority of the emperor.³⁹

Moreover, *Hermas* expects the final defeat of the empire. In *Vis.* 1,3,4 it is predicted that God will alter the heavens, mountains, hills and seas and will level everything for his elect.⁴⁰ Eventually the established order will be replaced by God's kingdom.⁴¹ *Hermas'* views are at odds with the claims of imperial ideol-

35 See *Sim.* 5,7,3: αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἐστὶν πάντα ἡ ἐξουσία. See also *Sim.* 9,23,4, "God our Lord is the ruler of all and has power over all his creation" (ὁ θεὸς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ὁ πάντων κυριεύων καὶ ἔχων πάσης τῆς κτίσεως αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐξουσίαν).

36 See *Vis.* 3,3,5 (παντοκράτωρ). Cf. *Sim.* 5,7,4, where the reading *omnipotens* by L¹ is probably secondary.

37 See *Man.* 7,2: φοβούμενος γὰρ τὸν κύριον κατακυριεύσεις τοῦ διαβόλου, ὅτι δύναμις ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν. See also *Man.* 9,11.

38 See *Sim.* 9,14,5: πάντα ἡ κτίσις διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ βαστάζεται. God's Son is the foundation of all creation. See also BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 427–428.

39 For a similar conclusion, see, e.g., on Q: M. FRENSCHKOWSKI, *Kyrios in Context: Q 6:46, the Emperor as "Lord", and the Political Implications of Christology in Q*, in LABAHN – ZANGENBERG (eds.), *Zwischen den Reichen*, pp. 95–118, pp. 112–114; on Matthew: W. CARTER, *Matthew and the Margins: A Socio-Political and Religious Reading* (JSNTS, 204), Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 2000, pp. 42–43; on Mark: G. GUTTENBERGER, *Why Caesarea Philippi of all Sites? Some Reflections on the Political Background and Implications of Mark 8:27–30 for the Christology of Mark*, in LABAHN – ZANGENBERG (eds.), *Zwischen den Reichen*, pp. 119–131, p. 119; on Luke: M. MEISER, *Lukas und die römische Staatsmacht*, in LABAHN – ZANGENBERG (eds.), *Zwischen den Reichen*, pp. 175–193, p. 190 (with reservations); on John: RICHEY, *Roman Imperial Ideology*, pp. 64–65; and on Paul (1 Thess): K.P. DONFRIED, *The Imperial Cults of Thessalonica and Political Conflict in 1 Thessalonians*, in R.A. HORSLEY (ed.), *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*, Harrisburg, PA, Trinity, 1997, pp. 215–223, p. 217.

40 See *Vis.* 1,3,4: ὁ θεὸς [...] ἰδοὺ μεθιστάνει τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τὰ ὄρη καὶ τοὺς βουνοὺς καὶ τὰς θαλάσσας, καὶ πάντα ὁμαλὰ γίνεται τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς.

41 For the kingdom of God, see *Sim.* 9,12,3–5,8; 9,13,2; 9,15,2–3; 9,16,2–4; 9,20,2–3; 9,29,2 (all using ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ); and 9,31,2 (*dei regnum*).

ogy, which regards the power of the emperor as divinely sanctioned.⁴² Hermas challenges the authority and venerability of the emperor.

2.2 “Apotheosis” Available to All Believers

The authority of the emperor and the status of the cult are challenged in yet another way. Hermas plays on the idea of an “apotheosis” for Christian believers. In the opening scene of *Hermas*, Rhoda’s transferral from earth to heaven is described in similar terms as the apotheosis of Roman emperors like Romulus, Caesar and Augustus in Roman literature.⁴³ For Hermas, some kind

42 See, e.g., L.A. Seneca, *Clem.* 1,1,2 (ed. BRAUND), on Nero: “is it not that I of all mortals have found favour and have been chosen to serve on earth as representative of the gods?” (*egone ex omnibus mortalibus placui electusque sum, qui in terris deorum uice fungere?*). See further, e.g., CARTER, *Matthew and the Margins*, pp. 39–43.

43 For Romulus, see, e.g., Livy, *Ab urbe condita* 1,16,1 (ed. FOSTER): “from that moment Romulus was no longer on earth” (*nec deinde in terris Romulus fuit*); and v. 3: “then, when a few had taken the initiative, they all hailed Romulus as a god and as a son of god, the king and father of the city of Rome” (*deinde, a paucis initio facto, deum deo natum, regem parentemque urbis Romanae salvere universi Romulum iubent*). See also Ovid, *Metam.* 14,805–852 (ed. MILLER – GOOLD): First, Romulus is taken from earth to heaven (*ablatus terris inponere caelo*, l. 811) and is designated as the god Quirinus (ll. 828.834.836.851). Then, his wife Hersilia is taken up by a star to heaven (ll. 846–848) and joins her husband as the goddess (*dea*) Hora (l. 851). Similarities with *Hermas* include the Roman context (*urbs Romana*, Livy, 1,16,3 – Πῶμῃ, *Vis.* 1,1,1), the transferral to “heaven” (*caelum*, Ovid, 811—οὐρανός, *Vis.* 1,1,4), the transferral itself (*ablatus*, Ovid, 811—ἀνελήμφθην, *Vis.* 1,1,5), the designation of the transferral as a “reward” (*praemia*, Ovid, 808–811—μισθός, *Sim.* 5,6,7) and the term “goddess” (*dea*, Ovid, 851—θεά, *Vis.* 1,1,7). The similarities are not strong enough to assume any literary dependence.

For Julius Caesar, see, e.g., the Latin inscription 2628 (ed. MOMMSEN IX, p. 246): “to the Genius of the divine Julius, father of the fatherland, whom the senate and the people of Rome assigned to the gods” (*genio dei Iuli parentis patriae quem senatus populusque Romanus in deorum numerum rettulit*).

For Caesar Augustus, see, e.g., one of the various calendars s.v. 17 September AD 14 (ed. DEGRASSI XIII.11, p. 510): “holiday by decree of the senate, because on that day heavenly honours have been decreed to Divus Augustus by the senate” (*fer(iae) ex s(enatus) c(onsulto), q(uod) e(o) d(ie) divo Augusto honores caelestes a senatu decreti*). See also Velleius Paterculus, *Hist. Rom.* 2,124,3 (ed. and trans. SHIPLEY): “after heaven had claimed his father [i.e. Augustus], and human honours had been paid to his body as divine honours were paid to his soul . . .” (*post redditum caelo patrem et corpus eius humanis honoribus, numen divinis honoratum . . .*).

All three examples include the two elements of apotheosis: an ascension from earth to heaven and a designation of divine or celestial status. Seneca’s satire *Apocolocyntosis* (ed. LUND) on Claudius also includes these two elements: Claudius’ ascension from earth

of apotheosis is not exclusively available to a select group of the emperor and other highplaced persons,⁴⁴ but to all God's servants. Hermas' use of apotheosis terminology for ordinary humans goes against the claims related to the veneration of the emperor.

2.3 Criticism as Affirmation of Identity

Hermas does not seem to accept the veneration of the emperor, but he does not criticize God's servants for participation in the cult: they are criticized for many things, but not for being venerators of the emperor. Two passages may relate to the emperor cult. *Man.* 4,1,9 criticizes "the one who does things similar to what outsiders do". Most likely, idolatry is meant.⁴⁵ In *Sim.* 9,21 idolatry (εἰδωλολατρία) is explicitly rejected. It is stated that the fourth mountain of Hermas' vision represents believers (πιστεύσαντες, v. 1) who are doubleminded (διψυχοι, vv. 1–3): when they hear of tribulation (θλίψις), they become idolaters (εἰδωλολατρουσι) because of their cowardice and because they are ashamed of the name of their Lord (v. 3).⁴⁶ It is reasonable to assume that the critique on idolatry includes the veneration of the emperor.⁴⁷ The critique in these two passages is more a warning against participation in the cult than a condemnation of an actual practice by members of the community. As such, the function of the critique is to affirm and strengthen the identity of the addressed community.⁴⁸

to heaven (*in terris . . . in caelo*, 5,1) and his wish to become a god (*deus*, 8,1–3). These two elements are also found in *Hermas*.

44 For this idea in Greco-Roman thought, see, e.g., P.G. BOLT, *Life, Death and the Afterlife in the Greco-Roman World*, in R.N. LONGENECKER (ed.), *Life in the Face of Death: The Resurrection Message in the New Testament*, Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 1998, pp. 51–79, p. 77.

45 See, e.g. Jer 5,7 LXX (ed. RAHLFS). See also DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 507; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 112 n. 17. See Chapter 3.

46 See *Sim.* 9,21,1–3: οἱ διψυχοι, ὅταν θλίψιν ἀκούσωσι, διὰ τὴν δειλίαν αὐτῶν εἰδωλολατρουσι καὶ το ὄνομα ἐπαισχύνονται τοῦ κυρίου αὐτῶν.

47 See also LEUTZSCH, *Wahrnehmung*, pp. 79 and 213.

48 For a similar conclusion on the function of Christian polemics against the emperor cult, yet not with regard to *Hermas*, but to the book of Revelation, see H.J. DE JONGE, *The Function of Religious Polemics: The Case of the Revelation of John versus the Imperial Cult*, in T.L. HETTEMA – A. VAN DER KOOIJ – J.A.M. SNOEK (eds.), *Religious Polemics in Context* (STAR, 11), Assen, Van Gorcum, 2004, pp. 276–290, p. 289.

Concluding Remarks

In expressing his views on the authorities, Hermas appears to be somewhat reticent. His views are not so much characterized by hostility as by indifference. He contends that the lord of the world in which believers live rightly (*δικαίως*) expects them to obey to his laws (*Sim.* 1,4). Moreover, he states that if believers come into conflict with the authorities, they should avoid confrontations (*Sim.* 1,5–6). Hermas' reticence is not a tactical move aiming at favourable neutrality of the authorities to the advantage of the church, for instance in fear of persecutions, for socio-economic reasons, or for the sake of mission among outsiders. It seems that for the author, who belongs to a small minority and to the lower social classes of society, any revolutionary ideas are out of the question.

Hermas does not explicitly mention the emperor cult. But the critique on idolatry, which may well include the worship of the emperor (*Man.* 4,1,9 and *Sim.* 9,21,3), the emphasis on God's supreme power (*Vis.* 3,3,5; *Sim.* 5,7,3; and 9,23,4), the expectation of the replacement of the established order (*Vis.* 1,3,4) by God's kingdom (*Sim.* 9,12,3–5.8; 9,13,2; 9,15,2–3; 9,16,2–4; 9,20,2–3; 9,29,2; and 9,31,2) and the use of apotheosis terminology for ordinary humans (*Vis.* 1,1,4–5.7), all indicate that the veneration of the emperor is challenged and rejected. The way in which the author formulates his critique indicates that he is not so much criticizing an actual practice among community members as warning against worshipping others than God alone. By doing so, Hermas attempts to affirm and strengthen the identity of the Christian community.

Women

This chapter examines the characterization and role of women in *Hermas*.¹ It points at the author's ambivalent views on women with regard to sexuality, female visibility and gender roles.

1 Sexuality

There is a striking contrast between the depiction of Hermas' former matron Rhoda and Hermas' wife.² Rhoda is depicted as a Roman matron who bought Hermas as a slave from the one who raised him.³ She is probably meant to be

1 Thanks are due to Professor Carolyn Osiek and to Dr Mona Tokarek LaFosse for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this chapter, which I presented at the *SBL Annual Meeting* in San Francisco on 20 November 2011. The present chapter includes material of my publication "A Jan Steen Household": *The Domestic Church in the Shepherd of Hermas*, in T. KNIIPS – G. MANNION – P. DE MEY (eds.), *The Household of God and Local Households—Revisiting the Domestic Church* (BETL, 254), Leuven, Peeters, 2013, pp. 235–247. I thank Peeters for permission to include the material here.

2 It is unknown whether Rhoda (*Vis.* 1,1,1) and Grapte (*Vis.* 2,4,3) (see also Maximus in *Vis.* 2,3,4 and Clement in *Vis.* 2,4,3) are real persons or not.

3 See *Vis.* 1,1,1: "the one who raised me, sold me to a certain Rhoda" (ὁ θρέψας με πέπραχέν με Ῥόδῃ τινί). For the interpretation of ὁ θρέψας as "foster parent", see, e.g., DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 426 ("[Herr und] Ziehvater"); BROX, *Hirt*, p. 79 ("Ziehvater [und Besitzer]"); and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 42 (the one who raised the foundling Hermas as a slave in his house). For the idea that Rhoda was a Roman matron, see, e.g., DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 428 ("eine römische Dame"); BROX, *Hirt*, p. 76 (Hermas' former "Besitzerin"); and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 42 (female patron).

There is the following text-critical problem. S reads Ῥόδῃ τινί; Bo εν τινί [...]; A προς γυναικα τινα; L¹ *quandam puellam*; L² *cuidam feminae nomine Radae*; and E *Rodae*. The reading of S is accepted by WHITTAKER; JOLY; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN. Ῥόδῃ is well attested: in S, (L²) and E (the reading in L² is probably a spelling error, cf. Acts 12,13: Ῥόδῃ). A and L¹ are probably secondary. The name may have been omitted because the other person mentioned in the same verse is nameless (ὁ θρέψας). DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 425, argues that L¹ deliberately turned the person into a youth mate and fellow-slave of Hermas: "[L¹] will also die ganze Erzählung wahrscheinlich auf eine Jugendgefährtin und Mitsklavin des Hermas bezogen wissen". An argument against the reading of L¹ (*puella*) is that Hermas calls Rhoda in v. 5 "Madam" (κυρία). For these reasons, the reading Ῥόδῃ is to be preferred. "A certain" is widely attested (S Bo A L¹ L²) and therefore probably original (that is, the reading of E is probably

a woman of some wealth and social position. It is narrated that Hermas meets her again after many years and begins to love her “as a sister” (ὡς ἀδελφήν).⁴ The wording suggests that his love for her is not erotic, but affectionate.⁵ But when he assists her while she is bathing in the River Tiber, he admires her beauty and thinks to himself how happy he would be if he had such a wife.⁶ He denies having any sexual thoughts,⁷ but it is clear that some wishful thinking is involved.⁸ As Epictetus writes: if a man seeing a handsome woman thinks

secondary). L² offers a further elaboration (*lectio longior*) and is therefore likely to be secondary. The remaining question is whether one should read Ῥόδη τινι (S), or ἐν τινι Ῥόδῃ (Bo, if the *lacuna* is to be completed in this way). In the New Testament there are various examples of τις before as well as after a proper name. For the former, see, e.g., Mark 15,21 (τινα Σίμωνα Κυρηναῖον); Acts 9,43 and 10,6 (παρά τινι Σίμωνι); 19,14 (τινος Σκευᾶ, v.l. τινος Σ.); and 25,19 (περί τινος Ἰησοῦ). For the latter, see, e.g., Luke 23,26 (Σίμωνά τινα Κυρηναῖον, v.l. τινα Σ. Κ.); Acts 10,5 (Σίμωνα τινα, v.l. om. τ.); 19,24 (Δημήτριος γάρ τις); 21,16 (Μνάσωνι τινι); 22,12 (Ἀνανίας δέ τις); and 24,1 (Τερτύλλου τινός). Yet, the reading with a preposition, followed by τις, followed by a proper name (as in Acts 9,43; 10,6; 25,19; and Bo) is the smoothest reading and therefore probably secondary. Therefore, it seems that the most original reading is found in S.

4 See Vis. 1,1,1.

5 See esp. *Sim.* 9,11,3: “With us [i.e., the virgins] ... you [Hermas] will sleep as a brother and not as a husband. For you are our brother” (μεθ’ ὑμῶν ... κοιμηθήσῃ ὡς ἀδελφός, καὶ οὐχ ὡς ἀνὴρ. ἡμέτερος γὰρ ἀδελφός εἶ). The first time, “brother” is used in the sense of “not as a sexual partner” (the second time it means “as a fellow-Christian”). See also Vis. 2,2,3: Hermas’ wife will be “a sister” (ἀδελφή) to him (cf. Vis. 2,3,1, where “your sister” [τὴν ἀδελφήν σου] refers to Hermas’ wife). For the idea that ὡς ἀδελφήν has an asexual connotation, see, e.g., DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 426; BROX, *Hirt*, p. 78; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 42. Pace, e.g., W.J. WILSON, *The Career of the Prophet Hermas*, in *HTR* 20 (1927) 21–62, pp. 23–24 n. 2, who thinks that “as a sister” refers to the meeting again of Hermas and Rhoda in the Christian gathering; and SNYDER, *Shepherd*, p. 28, who rejects an asexual connotation.

6 See Vis. 1,1,2.

7 See Vis. 1,1,2,7.

8 See also DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 426; BROX, *Hirt*, p. 78; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 43. See further, e.g., BROX, *Hirt*, p. 273: “Die ‘Begier nach einer anderen Frau’ scheint eines der persönlichen moralischen Probleme des H[ermas] selbst gewesen zu sein (Vis I 1,2,5–9; 2,1,4); jedenfalls gehört sie zu den wenigen Sünden, die am fehlerhaften H[ermas] identifiziert werden”; and p. 18: “nicht fiktiv ist ... ‘die Welt’, mit der sich H[ermas] befaßt und die seine Welt ist ... eine Welt von Frauen mit den zugehörigen Problemen von Ehe(bruch), Askese und verführerischen Jungfrauen”. Pace, e.g., T.M. WEHOFER, *Die Genesis eines judenchristlichen Prophetenbuches (Hermas). Untersuchungen zur altchristlichen Epistolographie*, in *SAWW.PH* 143/17 (1901) 43–56, p. 51: “so zeigt er damit einen ästhetischen Sinn für plastische Formen ... denn ... es [handelte] sich ihm, dem Christen, wirklich nur um eine ästhetische und nicht eine sexuelle Empfindung”; and PLOOIJ, *Eine enkratitische Glosse*, p. 4: “Das kann doch nur heißen, daß irgendwelche fleischliche Begierde ihm völlig fern war”.

“her husband is a happy man”, he thinks, in fact, “happy is the adulterer”.⁹ After some time, Rhoda appears to Hermas in a vision as a heavenly figure. She tells him that his feelings for her were sinful, evil desires.¹⁰ This disapproval has been explained from Hermas’ Christian conscience,¹¹ but this is probably not the whole story. In the Roman world romantic relationships between a matron and her own freedman, though well attested,¹² were generally considered to be inappropriate.¹³

Hermas’ relationship with his wife is described in a very different way. Hermas writes that it was revealed to him that his wife would be “as a sister” to him.¹⁴ In *Hermas* this expression refers to sexual abstinence.¹⁵ Hermas’ relationship

-
- 9 See Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2,18,15 (ed. OLDFATHER): “Today . . . when I saw a beautiful woman I did not say to myself. . . ‘Her husband must be a happy man’ (μακάριος ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς), for one who says ‘happy’ implies ‘(happy is) the adulterer’ (ὁ γὰρ τοῦτ’ εἰπὼν ‘μακάριος’ καὶ ‘ὁ μοιχός’).” For the reference to Epictetus, see already DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 427. See also J.S. JEFFERS, *Jewish and Christian Families in First-Century Rome*, in DONFRIED – RICHARDSON (eds.), *Judaism and Christianity*, pp. 128–150, p. 140: “We do not know how well Roman Christians in general lived up to a strict sexual ethic”. For Roman women seeking erotic satisfaction outside marriage, see J.P. HALLETT, *Women’s Lives in the Ancient Mediterranean*, in KRAEMER – D’ANGELO (eds.), *Women & Christian Origins*, pp. 13–34, pp. 31–32. Rhoda is not portrayed as the woman who seduced Hermas: see LEUTZSCH, *Wahrnehmung*, p. 169.
- 10 See *Vis.* 1,1,8. See further *Man.* 4,1,1.
- 11 See LANE FOX, *Pagans and Christians*, p. 382.
- 12 For references, see C. OSIEK – M.Y. MACDONALD – J.H. TULLOCH, *A Woman’s Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity*, Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 2006, p. 203.
- 13 P.R.C. WEAVER, *Children of Freedmen (and Freedwomen)*, in B. RAWSON (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome*, Canberra, Humanities Research Centre; Oxford, Clarendon, 1991, pp. 166–190, p. 180, argues that there was “a distinct prejudice against a freeborn *patrona* marrying her own *libertus*”. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 43 n. 7, objects: “even the random selection of inscriptions preserved in *CIL* 6 contains nine cases in Rome in which funerary monuments publicly proclaimed this supposedly socially unacceptable practice”. A public proclamation, however, does not necessarily imply that the practice involved is generally regarded as socially acceptable. Cf. the (adapted) formulation in OSIEK – MACDONALD – TULLOCH, *A Woman’s Place*, p. 203: “Marriages between a *patrona* and her *libertus*, though heavily discouraged by social disapproval and even forbidden by law at some points, are not unknown”.
- 14 See *Vis.* 2,2,3: the woman church tells Hermas that he is to make known her words to his children and “to your wife, who will be as a sister to you” (τῇ συμβίῳ σου τῇ μελλούσῃ σου ἀδελφῇ).
- 15 See *Vis.* 1,1,1 and *Sim.* 9,11,3 (see above). Cf. LEUTZSCH, *Wahrnehmung*, p. 174: “ein Verbot sexueller Interaktion”. But the idea of a “prohibition” may go too far. Cf. also U. ERNST, *Der Hirt des Hermas. Verführung zum Umdenken in der erotischen Sophiakirche*, in

with his wife reflects the early Christian custom of what later became known as “spiritual marriage”.¹⁶ For a Christian in a Roman setting, spiritual marriage may well have been a compromise: celibacy for religious reasons and marriage

-
- L. SCHOTTRUFF – M.-T. WACKER (eds.), *Kompendium Feministische Bibelauslegung*, Gütersloh, Kaiser – Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1998, pp. 778–788, p. 782: “Sexuelle Sensibilität und Zurückhaltung von seiten des Hermas und Anerkennung seiner Frau als ‘Schwester’ bedeuten daher hier einen Verzicht auf die Ausübung negativer Macht in der Beziehung”.
- 16 See OSIEK – BALCH, *Families*, p. 154; OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 55 n. 5, 228–229; and A. JENSEN, *Frauen im frühen Christentum* (TC, 11), Bern, Peter Lang, 2002, pp. xxx and 140–142 (“Geistliche Ehe”). See already C.J. HEFELE, *Patrum apostolicorum opera*, Tübingen, Laupp, 1855⁴, p. 418 n. 1 (“so, it can be concluded that it was already customary to live with *subintroductae*, hinc colligi potest, morem cum subintroductis vivendi jam invaluisse”); FUNK, *Hermas Pastor*, pp. 596–597 (“it seems to me that this custom [to live with *subintroductae*] already existed in the second century” [ref. to *Hermas*], *mihi... videtur, morem illum [morem cum subintroductis vivendi] iam saeculo secundo invaluisse*); H. ACHELIS, *Virgines subintroductae. Ein Beitrag zum VII. Kapitel des 1. Korintherbriefs*, Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1902; ID., *Agapētae*, in *ERE* 1 (1908) 177–180, esp. p. 179 (“Hermas seems to regard spiritual marriage, in all its forms, as a precious characteristic of the life of the Christian community”); H. WEINEL, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, in E. HENNECKE (ed.), *Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1914², pp. 290–323, pp. 315–316 (“Die ganze Scene (10,6–11,8) enthält wahrscheinlich eine Verteidigung des von Propheten und christlichen Asketen geübten Brauches, mit Jungfrauen in einem geschlechtlich reinen Verhältnis zusammenzuleben”); JOLY, *Hermas*, pp. 48 (“C’est une apologie des *virgines subintroductae*”), 312–313 n. 1; E.A. CLARK, *John Chrysostom and the Subintroductae*, in *ChH* 46 (1977) 171–185, p. 172, who claims that *Hermas* is the earliest witness to the practice of spiritual marriage in Christian literature; W. SCHÄFKE, *Frühchristlicher Widerstand*, in W. HAASE (ed.), *Principat. Religion (vorkonstantinisches Christentum: Verhältnis zu römischem Staat und heidnischer Religion)* (ANRW, 2.23.1), Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 1979, pp. 460–723, p. 515 with nn. 332–333, who takes *Vis.* 2,2 and *Sim.* 9,11 as evidence for a “spiritual marriage” (“geistliche Ehe”), but distinguishes the situation of Hermas and his wife from the practice of *virgines subintroductae*: “Entweder entschloß sich ein Ehepaar, enthaltsam zu leben [*Hermas Vis.* 2,2], oder einem Asketen schlossen sich eine oder mehrere Gesinnungsgenossinnen an, die *virgines subintroductae*”. Cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 98 on *Vis.* 2,2,3 (see also p. 411 on *Sim.* 9,11,3): “[deutet] auf künftiger... enkratistisches Leben der Eheleuten”. Critical are, e.g., P. DE LABRIOLLE, *Le ‘mariage spirituel’ dans l’Antiquité chrétienne*, in *RH* 137 (1921) 204–225, pp. 209–210: “Cette demi-complaisance d’imagination dissimule-t-elle une tentative apologétique au bénéfice du mariage spirituel? Je ne le pense pas”; and DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 619: “Zum mindesten erklären sich nicht alle Züge unseres Abschnitts aus dem Blick auf das Syneisaktentum”. The use of the terms *parthenoi syneisaktai* or *virgines subintroductae* (as Balch and Osiek do) is, of course, anachronistic, but the underlying idea of a relationship whereby the partners live together in celibacy is indeed present in *Hermas*.

because of socio-cultural expectations. It has been argued that Hermas' spiritual marriage "did not make him a preacher of virginity".¹⁷ It is, however, the opposite that should be stressed here: Hermas, author of a text in which the family plays such an important role, stresses the preference of a celibate life.

The marriage between the figure Hermas and his wife is possibly meant to be an arranged marriage, but this cannot be proven. It has been noted that, "marriage in Rome . . . was a phenomenon altogether separate from erotically pleasurable mating".¹⁸ It is true that arranged marriages were not necessarily unromantic.¹⁹ Nevertheless, in Roman society marriage was primarily meant to bring forth children, especially sons, in order to continue the family name and to maintain the family's property.²⁰ It is, therefore, not unrealistic that on the storyline Hermas is at some point more interested in Rhoda than in his own wife.²¹

For Hermas, marriage is not so much the "normal" way, as is indicated by the author's views on divorce and remarriage. In *Man.* 4 the following rules are set out, which are explicitly said to apply to both husband and wife.²² If a believer finds out that one's partner has committed adultery and the partner does not

-
- 17 See P. BROWN, *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (LHR, 13), New York, Columbia University Press, 1988, p. 72. See further OSIEK – MACDONALD – TULLOCH, *A Woman's Place*, p. 39, who argue that Hermas does not expect the whole community to take up spiritual marriage.
 - 18 See HALLETT, *Women's Lives*, p. 32, referring to the anthropologist Laura Betzig.
 - 19 For this argument, see S. DIXON, *Sex and the Married Woman in Ancient Rome*, in D.L. BALCH – C. OSIEK (eds.), *Early Christian Families in Context: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue* (Religion, Marriage, and Family), Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, Eerdmans, 2003, pp. 111–129, p. 112.
 - 20 See, e.g., D'AMBRA, *Calculus of Venus*, pp. 219–232, esp. pp. 221 and 225. For further references, see DIXON, *Sex*, p. 112 n. 2.
 - 21 Cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 273, who notes that sexual feelings for another woman than his own wife seem to have been a personal problem of Hermas'.
 - 22 See *Man.* 4,1,8: "this praxis applies to a woman as well as to a man" (αὐτῇ ἢ πρᾶξις ἐπὶ γυναικὶ καὶ ἀνδρὶ κεῖται); and v. 10: "be it a man or a woman" (εἴτε ἀνὴρ εἴτε γυνή). See also, e.g., DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 506; BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 205–206; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 111, who rightly state that the perspective of the husband is the primary point of view, but that this perspective is widened in vv. 8 and 10. Cf. M.R. D'ANGELO, *Roman Imperial Family Values and the Gospel of Mark: The Divorce Sayings (Mark 10:2–12)*, in S.P. AHEARNE-KROLL – P.A. HOLLOWAY – J.A. KELHOFFER (eds.), *Women and Gender in Ancient Religions: Interdisciplinary Approaches* (WUNT, 263), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2010, pp. 59–83; and EAD., *(Re)presentations of Women in the Gospel of Matthew and Luke-Acts*, in KRAEMER – D'ANGELO (eds.), *Women & Christian Origins*, pp. 171–195, who does not note that the ruling applies to both husband and wife.

change his or her life, divorce is mandatory.²³ Yet, if the partner does change, one is to take him or her back.²⁴ For this reason remarriage is not allowed, because one is to give the partner a chance (that is, one chance) to change.²⁵ Remarriage after the death of one's partner is allowed, but it is not encouraged: it is "a greater status and great honour before the Lord" to remain unmarried.²⁶

These regulations have been taken as "a way of more rigorous virtue, a more exemplary exercise of restraint (ἐγκράτεια)".²⁷ Hermas is, however, more likely to be "less-than-rigorous". It has been pointed out that Hermas' views on divorce and remarriage are to be regarded as a further specification of rules which in their absolute form (no divorce or remarriage) were already before *Hermas* felt to be difficult to meet.²⁸ Even if this is indeed the case, the following still stands. The very fact that the issue of divorce after adultery is even being raised and that second marriages are not encouraged indicates that Hermas' views on the married state are not so positive.²⁹

-
- 23 See *Man.* 4,1,4–6. In v. 4 Hermas asks the Shepherd: "if one has a wife (γυναῖκα) who believes in the Lord (πιστὴν ἐν κυρίῳ) and finds her in some kind of adultery (ταύτην εὖρη ἐν μοιχείᾳ τινί), does the man then sin when he lives with her?" In v. 5 the Shepherd replies that the man does not sin as long as he does not know about the adultery: "When the man knows about her sin, and the woman does not change (μὴ μετανόησῃ), but remains in her filthiness (τῇ πορνείᾳ αὐτῆς) and the man remains with her, he becomes accessory to her sin and shares in her adultery (κοινωνὸς τῆς μοιχείας αὐτῆς)". In v. 6 Hermas asks the Shepherd what a man should do in such a situation, to which the Shepherd answers: "He should abandon . . . her" (ἀπολυσάτω . . . αὐτήν).
- 24 See *Man.* 4,1,7–8. In v. 7 Hermas asks: "When . . . after the wife has been abandoned, the wife changes (μετανόησῃ) and wants to return to her husband, should she than not be reaccepted?" The Shepherd replies: "Yes, . . . when the man does not reaccept her, he sins".
- 25 See *Man.* 4,1,6.8: "the man should stay on his own: when he, having left his wife, marries another, he commits adultery himself (αὐτὸς μοιχᾶται)" (v. 6); and "the one who has sinned but changes is to be reaccepted (δεῖ παραδεχθῆναι τὸν ἡμαρτηκότα καὶ μετανοοῦντα): but not many times, because for the servants of God there is one chance to change (μετάνοιά ἐστιν μία, v. 8)".
- 26 See *Man.* 4,4,2.
- 27 See D'ANGELO, *Roman Imperial Family*, p. 77.
- 28 See J. VERHEYDEN, *The Shepherd of Hermas and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament*, in A.F. GREGORY – C.M. TUCKETT (eds.), *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005, pp. 293–329, p. 326. Compare Matt 5,32; 19,9; and 1 Cor 7,10–11.39–40.
- 29 Pace BROWN, *Body and Society*, p. 69, who argues that Hermas never moved far from the life and the values of the married *paterfamilias*.

2 Female Visibility

There is another ambivalence that relates to Hermas' wife. She is blamed for being talkative, but does not say a word in the whole book.

She is accused of "not holding her tongue, with which she does evil".³⁰ It is difficult to say what this accusation exactly means. It may be an example of stereotyping women as speaking indiscreetly (as in Sir 26,27). Another option is that it means being talkative, perhaps in the Christian assembly (as in 1 Cor 14,34–35).³¹ Finally, it might refer to tittle-tattle or lying.³² In any case, it seems to involve a form of female visibility (or "audibility") which is regarded as inappropriate.³³

Hermas writes that his wife talks too much, but on the level of the narrative her voice is silenced. Her name is not even mentioned. In *Hermas* women are not silenced altogether.³⁴ There are several women who talk a lot: the heavenly Rhoda, the woman church and the virgins.³⁵ These women, however, only speak in Hermas' visionary experiences. Rhoda, for instance, does not speak in the scene in which she is still alive, but only in the passage in which she appears to Hermas as a heavenly figure.³⁶ The "real" women of the story do not speak. This may be seen as an indication that Hermas does not encourage Christian women to raise their voice.

30 See *Vis.* 2,2,3: αὕτη οὐκ ἀπέχεται τῆς γλώσσης, ἐν ᾗ πονηρεύεται.

31 For these two options, see LEUTZSCH, *Wahrnehmung*, pp. 172–173; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 54–55. Cf. OSIEK – MACDONALD – TULLOCH, *A Woman's Place*, p. 264 n. 60: "This seems to reflect a general attitude about the inclination of women to lack restraint in speaking . . . rather than a specific episode involving the wife speaking out in church".

32 For the former, see, e.g., OSIEK – MACDONALD – TULLOCH, *A Woman's Place*, p. 39. For the latter, cf. LEUTZSCH, *Wahrnehmung*, p. 173, who interprets it as "Zungensünde", of which the exact meaning remains unclear.

33 Cf. ERNST, *Hirt*, p. 782: "Das 'Vergehen mit der Zunge' ist kein geschlechtsspezifischer Vorwurf an Frauen, sondern gehört zuerst zur traditionellen ersttestamentlich-jüdischen Paränese wie der Ermahnung der Umwelt".

34 For the silencing of women in early Christian literature, see, e.g., B.E. REID, *Prophetic Voices of Elizabeth, Mary, and Anna in Luke 1–2*, in J. CORLEY (ed.), *New Perspectives on the Nativity*, London – New York, T&T Clark, 2009, pp. 37–46.

35 For Rhoda, see *Vis.* 1,1,4–9. For the woman church, see *Vis.* 1,2,2–1,4,3; 2,1,3; 2,4,2–3; 3,1,2–3; 3,1,6–3,2,4; 3,3,1–3,10,2; 3,10,6; and 4,2,2–4,3,6. For the virgins, see *Sim.* 9,3,2; 9,5,7; and 9,11,1–8.

36 For the former, see *Vis.* 1,1,1–2. For the latter, vv. 4–9.

3 Gender Roles

It has been contended that in *Hermas* there is no emphasis on one social group, like wives, being subordinate to another.³⁷ It has been noted that “most of the women in the story are not at all under Hermas’s control”.³⁸ But again, Hermas’ views are ambivalent. Female figures like the woman church and the virgins are indeed portrayed as having control over Hermas.³⁹ But with regard to the building of the tower, women play a subordinate role to men.⁴⁰

The main examples of women who are not under Hermas’ control involve “visionary” women. The woman church, for instance, plays a dominant role. She is, however, not a representative example. She is obviously not under Hermas’ control, because she is his revelatory agent who represents the church, not an ordinary human being.⁴¹ Another example that has been used is the

37 See OSIEK – BALCH, *Families*, p. 2: “in authors like...Hermas, we failed to find this emphasis on one social group (wives or slaves) in the church being subordinate to another”. See also, e.g., ERNST, *Hirt*, p. 782: “Hermas kennt Frauen als gleichwertige, selbständig handelnde Gemeindeglieder”.

38 OSIEK – BALCH, *Families*, p. 147.

39 For the woman church, see, e.g., *Vis.* 3,1,8–9. In v. 8 the woman church says to Hermas: “Sit down here” (κάθισον ὧδε). When Hermas replies that others may sit first, she says: “What I say to you...sit down” (ὅ σοι λέγω...κάθισον). In v. 9 Hermas narrates that, when he wanted to sit at her right side, “she did not allow me (οὐκ εἰσέν με), but she beckoned me with her hand to sit at her left side”. It is clear that here the woman is in control. For the virgins, see *Sim.* 9,11,2: “you [Hermas] are given over to us [the παρθέναι]: you cannot go away from us” (ὕμῖν παρεδόθης· οὐ δύνασαι ἀφ’ ἡμῶν ἀναχωρήσαι).

40 See, e.g., *Vis.* 3,2,5 and *Sim.* 9,3,4.

41 M.M. SMITH, *Feminine Images in the Shepherd of Hermas* (PhD thesis, Duke University, 1979), pp. 106–107, 196, explains the fact that in *Hermas* the church is portrayed as a woman from Hermas’ personal experiences with women (like Rhoda and his wife) as well as from literary and cultural traditions. This implies that the fact that the church is a woman says something about Hermas’ views on women. It should be noted, however, that the lord of the tower/church as well as the Shepherd (Hermas’ revelatory agent in the major part of the work) are men. BROX, *Hirt*, 106, concludes with regard to Smith’s thesis: “Der an sich interessante Ansatz kommt aufgrund von Methode und Tendenz nicht zu haltbaren Ergebnissen” (see also p. 273 n. 18). See further LEUTZSCH, *Wahrnehmung*, pp. 179, 185, who argues on the basis of *Sim.* 9,1,1–3 that the revelations of the woman church are considered to be inferior to those of the Shepherd. See esp. p. 185: “Doch ist zugleich daran zu erinnern, daß dem Weiblichen gerade nach *sim* IX 1,1–3 ein gegenüber dem Männlichen inferiore Status eignet”. Cf. BARNARD, *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers*, pp. 162–163, who thinks the background of the figure of the woman church to be the “Shekinah” (the divine presence presented as a woman); and STAATS, *Hermas*, p. 106, who refers to the feminine gender of (the) “Spirit” in Judaism (“weibliche[s] Genus des Geistes im Jüdischen”).

contrast between the women or virgins who show ἀνδρεία and Hermas who is challenged to “be a man” (ἀνδρίζου, Ἑρμᾶ).⁴² This contrast, however, does not necessarily reflect the author’s views on intersexual relations. A third example involves the virgins with whom Hermas stays overnight.⁴³ Hermas is under their control: when he wants to leave, they do not let him go.⁴⁴ It should be noted, however, that it is the Shepherd who gave Hermas over to these virgins and that Hermas agreed with it.⁴⁵ Moreover, Hermas’ attitude to the virgins makes clear that he does not accept the women’s authority over him without any resistance (*Sim.* 9,11,2–3). Finally, the women are visionary figures. Overall,

In my view, the representation of the church as a woman can be sufficiently explained from literary convention: see esp. 2 John 1 and 2 *Clem.* 14,2 (ed. EHRMAN).

- 42 For the former, see, e.g., *Vis.* 3,8,4, where one of the women is said to be ἀνδριζομένη; and *Sim.* 9,2,5, where the virgins are portrayed as standing so ἀνδρείως “as if they were willing to support the whole heaven”. For the latter, *Vis.* 1,4,3; but cf. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 480, who takes this as “[eine] Mahnung an alle Christen”; and BROX, *Hirt*, p. 94: “Die Ermunterung des H[ermas] (ἀνδρίζου) zum Abschied läßt dramatische Bewährungen des H[ermas] für die Zukunft erwarten”. See further esp. S. YOUNG, *Being a Man: The Pursuit of Manliness in the Shepherd of Hermas*, in *JCS* 2 (1994) 237–255, p. 237: Hermas’ “‘transformation . . . into a man’ functions as a plot device in *The Shepherd of Hermas*”.

- 43 See *Sim.* 9,11,3.

- 44 See *Sim.* 9,11,2.6.

- 45 See *Sim.* 9,10,6, where Hermas says to the Shepherd: “Give . . . me over to them [to the παρθέναι] (παράδος . . . αὐταῖς με)”. The Shepherd summons the women (παρακαλεῖται αὐτάς) and says to them: “I trust this one to you (παρὰτίθεμαι ὑμῖν τοῦτον) until I come”. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 406, thinks that the “handing over” is meant to stress the “innocence” of the following scene that is full of erotic potential: “Die förmliche Übergabe des H[ermas] für die Zwischenzeit an die Jungfrauen durch den Hirten soll wohl gleich zu Beginn die ‘Unschuld’ im Verhalten der Jungfrauen und des H[ermas] in der folgenden Nachtgeschichte sicherstellen”. See further p. 410: “Die ‘Übergabe’ (10,6) verpflichtet die Jungfrauen, H[ermas] (zum Schutz?) nicht aus den Augen zu lassen (s. 11,2b); der Satz ist ein Befehl”. But perhaps there is something to be said for the idea that the handing over emphasizes that it is not the women, but the men (Hermas and especially the Shepherd) who are in charge. This is, for instance, indicated by the fact that Hermas is unwilling to obey to the women: “I [Hermas] said to them [the παρθέναι]: I will wait for him until the evening, but when he does not come, I will go home and will return in the early morning” (*Sim.* 9,11,2). See also LEUTZSCH, *Wahrnehmung*, p. 182 n. 152: “auch hier wird die Rahmenbedingung weiblicher Initiative durch männliches Handeln geschaffen”. Cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 410: “Daß H[ermas] trotz der ‘Übergabe’ durch den Hirten (10,6) und trotz der Aufforderung 11,1 nicht bleiben, sondern die Nacht zu Hause verbringen will, hat schon mit der keuschen Scham von 11,3 zu tun”.

the “visionary” level is to be distinguished from the “earthly” level.⁴⁶ It has been argued that ancient portrayals of goddesses and exemplary women were usually not meant to be models of identity, but of contrast. In Greco-Roman thought there was a gap between “heavenly” women and “earthly” women.⁴⁷

Hermas reflects rather traditional gender roles. On the level of the narrative men have the most important functions. To begin with, there is the family. The figure *Hermas* attempts to re-establish his authority as *paterfamilias* over his household.⁴⁸ *Hermas* identifies himself as “head of the household” (ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ οἴκου).⁴⁹ As *paterfamilias* he has failed to keep his wife and children under control.⁵⁰ He has been unable to find the right balance between his private life and his work.⁵¹ A Roman *paterfamilias* was held responsible for the transgressions of his household. *Hermas*’ shortcomings reflect his struggle to live up to the socio-cultural expectations of his time. This has to be changed. He is to admonish his family like a “smith who hammering at his work masters the object as he wishes”.⁵² His household is to be chastised.⁵³ So, *Hermas*’ role in the private sphere of the house is presented in detail; his wife’s role, however, is not mentioned. It has been argued that “household management was women’s

46 Cf. MACDONALD, *Reading Real Women*, p. 217: “The Greek term for ancient lady is *presbytera*, the female equivalent of the term used to describe the elders/presbyters (*presbyteros*), who are depicted as in charge of the church”; and OSIEK – MACDONALD – TULLOCH, *A Woman’s Place*, p. 42: it is possible that “women emerge as revealers in the text precisely because women like them . . . were important patrons of house churches”.

47 See also HALLETT, *Women’s Lives*, p. 21, who notes that in Greco-Roman material male and female divine beings engage in all sorts of activities that are on earth monopolized by men.

48 See also OSIEK – BALCH, *Families*, esp. pp. 147 and 164. For the definition of “patriarchal authority” as the authority of a *paterfamilias* over the persons and property in his power, see R.S. KRAEMER – M.R. D’ANGELO, *Introduction*, in EAED. (eds.), *Women & Christian Origins*, pp. 3–10, p. 4.

49 See *Sim.* 7.3.

50 See *Vis.* 1.3,1 and 2.3,1. See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 88–89: “[*Hermas*]’ Versäumnisse gegenüber der Familie (οἶκος) . . . H[ermas] war zu wenig streng . . . Er hat sein Haus . . . nicht in Ordnung”; p. 102: “[*Hermas* hat] als Hausvater versagt”; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 49, 56.

51 See *Vis.* 2.3,1: “you [*Hermas*] did not take care for them [*Hermas*’ οἶκος] (οὐκ ἐμέλησέν σοι περὶ αὐτῶν), but you have neglected (παρενεθυμήθης) them, being involved in wrong businesses”.

52 See *Vis.* 1.3,2: ὡς γὰρ χαλκεὺς σφυροκοπῶν τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ περιγίνεται τοῦ πράγματος οὐ θέλει.

53 See *Vis.* 2.3,1: *Hermas*’ children and wife “will be chastised . . . with right chastisement” (παιδευθήσονται . . . παιδείᾳ δικαίᾳ).

work”.⁵⁴ An argument used to support this position is that Philo of Alexandria regards οἰκονομία as the domain of women.⁵⁵ In *Hermas*, however, household management is described as men’s work. The two “household managers” that are mentioned are male: Hermas (who calls himself the “head” of his “household”) and the owner of the vineyard in *Sim.* 5,2,9 (who is called “householder”, οἰκοδεσπότης). (Even) the domestic domain is run by men.

To continue, there is the Christian community. Hermas makes three copies of the message he receives from the woman church.⁵⁶ Hermas is to read his copy to the presbyters who lead the ἐκκλησία in his city.⁵⁷ Clement, another man, is to send his copy to the Christian communities in the other cities.⁵⁸ Grapte, a woman, is to use her copy to admonish the widows and orphans.⁵⁹ Grapte’s role presumably takes place in the private sphere of the house or house church.⁶⁰ Hermas and Clement, by contrast, operate in the public sphere.

The information on Grapte is limited. It is stated that “Grapte will admonish (νουθετήσει) the widows and the orphans”. Scholars have made a lot of this information. It has been suggested, for instance, that Grapte might be a διάκονος or ἐπίσκοπος.⁶¹ Further, she would be a well-to-do leader of a house where widows

54 See K.J. TORJESEN, *When Women Were Priests: Women’s Leadership in the Early Church and the Scandal of Their Subordination in the Rise of Christianity*, New York, Harper San Francisco, 1995, p. 63.

55 See Philo, *Spec.* 3,170 (ed. MOSÈS). According to Philo, there are two types of πόλεις: towns (ἄστυ) and houses (οἰκίαι). The former are governed by men, which is called πολιτεία; the latter by women, which is called οἰκονομία.

56 One for Hermas himself (*Vis.* 2,1,3–4), one for Clement and one for Grapte (*Vis.* 2,4,3).

57 See *Vis.* 2,2,6 and 2,4,3.

58 See *Vis.* 2,4,3.

59 *Ibid.*

60 TORJESEN, *When Women Were Priests*, p. 37, notes that “For more than two hundred years Christianity was essentially a religion of the private sphere, practiced in the private space of the household”. Torjesen’s work is tendentious (as the title suggests), but some insights are nevertheless valuable. B.W. WINTER, *Roman Wives, Roman Widows: The Appearance of New Women and the Pauline Communities*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, MA, 2003, p. 116, notes that for the ancient world there is no evidence of professional female teachers outside the home: women had an educative role in the domestic domain.

61 See LEUTZSCH, *Wahrnehmung*, p. 161 with n. 26; and ID., *Hirt*, p. 402 n. 220. For the idea that Grapte was a deaconess, see already A. HILGENFELD, *Die apostolischen Väter. Untersuchungen über Inhalt und Ursprung der unter ihrem Namen erhaltenen Schriften*, Halle, Pfeffer, 1853, pp. 125–184, p. 163; and H. LIETZMANN, *Zur altchristlichen Verfassungsgeschichte*, in *ZWTh* 55 (1914) 97–153, p. 137; repr. in K. ALAND (ed.), *Hans Lietzmann. Kleine Schriften. I. Studien zur spätantiken Religionsgeschichte* (TU, 67 = 5.12), Berlin, Akademie, 1958, pp. 141–185, p. 173: “Dort [*Sim.* 9,26.27] erfahren wir, daß

and orphans live together.⁶² Her task would later on have evolved into the office of deaconess: her function would be that of “pastoral leader and teacher” being “responsible for the instruction and spiritual development of an identifiable group of widows and their children”.⁶³ Finally, she would be “the patron of a house-church community”, “a literate church leader”, “a freedwoman”, “a more well-to-do widow caring for other widows”, a “catechist and theologian”,⁶⁴ etc. Most of these interpretations, however, are unfounded.

die *διάκονοι* für Witwen und Waisen zu sorgen haben, und schließen daraus, daß die Vis. II, 4, 3 genannte Grapte, welche die Witwen und Waisen vermahnt, wohl eine weibliche Diakonos gewesen ist”. But cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 108: “Die Erwähnung der Witwen und Waisen in zwei so verschiedenen Zusammenhängen berechtigt bei H[ermas] nicht zu solchen systematisierenden Schlußfolgerungen”. Others who consider Grapte to be a deaconess include H. VON CAMPENHAUSEN, *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (BHTh, 14), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1953, p. 103: “Grapte ... [ist] wahrscheinlich eine angesehene römische Diakonisse”; R.M. HÜBNER, *Die Anfänge von Diakonat, Presbyterat und Episkopat in der frühen Kirche*, in A. RAUCH – P. IMHOF (eds.), *Das Priestertum in der Einen Kirche. Diakonat, Presbyterat und Episkopat. Regensburger Ökumenisches Symposium 1985, im Auftrag der Ökumene-Kommission der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz, 15.7. bis 21.7.1985* (Koin., 4), Aschaffenburg, Kaffke, 1987, pp. 45–89, p. 74: “Grapte ... ist wahrscheinlich als weiblicher Diakon anzusehen”; and ERNST, *Hirt*, p. 783: “Es läßt sich ... vermuten, daß Grapte eine Diakonin ist”. But if Grapte was indeed a deaconess, it is difficult to understand why her title is not mentioned. See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 109: “die Beauftragung der Grapte zeigt, wie wenig es dem H[ermas] auf die Beschreibung amtlicher Funktionen ankommt”.

62 See M.Y. MACDONALD, *Was Celsus Right? The Role of Women in the Expansion of Early Christianity*, in BALCH – OSIEK, *Early Christian Families* (eds.), pp. 157–184, p. 169. See already J. LEIPOLDT, *Die Frau in der antiken Welt und im Urchristentum*, Leipzig, Koehler & Amelang, 1965³, p. 143, who thinks of a particular group of widows and orphans who held their own gatherings in which they were taught by a woman. See also LAMPE, *Die stadtrömischen Christen*, p. 299 n. 682, who takes Grapte's task as that of separate religious instruction for widows and orphans (“Grapte ist ein schöner früher Beleg für kirchlich organisierte Kinderlehre”). But cf. A. VON HARNACK, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*. II. *Die Verbreitung*, Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1924⁴, pp. 841–842, who thinks that Grapte represents the “circle” that had the special, organized task to take care of the needy (“der diakonale Kreis”) and existed next to the “circle” that was responsible for the community as such (“der presbyterale Kreis”).

63 See K. MADIGAN – C. OSIEK (eds.), *Ordained Women in the Early Church: A Documented History*, Baltimore, MD – London, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005, pp. 25–26.

64 *Ibid.*, resp. pp. 42, 75–76 and 92.

It is true that Grapte's role presumes literacy and a certain amount of authority.⁶⁵ But details about her status or wealth are not given.⁶⁶ She is apparently more literate than Hermas, who had difficulties with distinguishing the syllables when he copied the booklet of the woman church.⁶⁷ But not only women of the upper-class were literate: lower class women sometimes worked as scribes.⁶⁸ Saying that Grapte was a freedwoman or widow is as speculative as suggesting that she was the wife of Clement who is mentioned in the same verse. Further, there is no evidence that widows and orphans formed their own community.⁶⁹ On the contrary, *Sim.* 9,27,2 refers to hospitable people who are used to receive needy people like widows into their houses.⁷⁰ The widows and orphans have been taken as a group of "widows and *their* children". But even if "orphans" is indeed meant in the sense of children who have lost their father, it remains uncertain whether the orphans and widows who are mentioned are related to each other.⁷¹ Further, it is uncertain whether Grapte had any official function.⁷² Titles like "deaconess" or "bishop" are not used.⁷³ Grapte's role is important, but should not be exaggerated.

On the "visionary" level of the text it is again men who carry the main responsibilities. In the vision of the tower around ten thousand men are carry-

65 See also OSIEK – BALCH, *Families*, p. 170. Grapte's role might indicate that she is a lady of some age, that is to say, not a youngster.

66 Cf. MADIGAN – OSIEK (eds.), *Ordained Women*, p. 26, who argue that Grapte belongs to the underclass Greek-speaking community of Rome.

67 See *Vis.* 2,1,4.

68 See, e.g., HALLETT, *Women's Lives*, p. 33. For literate elite women, Hallett (pp. 24–25) refers to, e.g., Seneca, *Marc.* 1,2, on one Marcia who loved books—as her father, an eminent historian, did; and Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* 5,26, on one Minucia Marcella who was devoted to books and learning, like her father. HALLETT, *Women's Lives*, p. 17, argues that the representations of urban, elite Roman women effected, reinforced or even created "assumptions and expectations about appropriate female behavior in lower social strata".

69 Pace MACDONALD, *Early Christian Women and Pagan Opinion: The Power of Hysterical Women*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996, p. 76; EAD., *Reading Real Women*, p. 217; and EAD., *Rereading Paul: Early Interpreters of Paul on Women and Gender*, in KRAEMER – D'ANGELO (eds.), *Women & Christian Origins*, pp. 236–253, p. 248.

70 See also *Man.* 8,10: "(to) help widows and (to) visit orphans" (χήραις ὑπηρετεῖν καὶ ὀρφάνους . . . ἐπισκέπτεσθαι).

71 An argument that might be used to support the idea that the widows and orphans were related is that orphans were probably taken care of in family circles.

72 Pace LEUTZSCH, *Wahrnehmung*, p. 161 n. 26: "Graptēs Tätigkeit . . . ist bereits institutionalisiert".

73 See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 108, who rightly designates such ideas about Grapte's putative title or official function as speculative.

ing stones to six young men who are building the tower.⁷⁴ Women have more an assisting role: they are commanded by men to carry stones through the door of the building and to give these to the builders,⁷⁵ to pick up stones that are rejected,⁷⁶ to guard⁷⁷ the tower, and so on. It is only in *Sim.* 9 that women (virgins) are themselves building the tower.⁷⁸ But here the Shepherd is in charge: he commanded them to do so (ἐκέλευσε τὰς παρθένους, *Sim.* 9,8,2). The building of the tower and thus the formation of the church is primarily a men's work.

In *Hermas* women do have a prominent role in daily life and in the Christian community.⁷⁹ The figures Rhoda and Grapte exemplify this. As such the work is not "androcentric".⁸⁰ But gender stereotypes are not really transcended. Language of equality is absent in the text. The readers or hearers are always

74 See *Vis.* 3,2,5; 3,4,1; 3,10,1; *Sim.* 9,3,1; and 9,4,4.

75 See *Sim.* 9,3,4–5 and 9,4,1,3,5,8.

76 See *Sim.* 9,8,2 and 9,9,5. Just to take the latter as example: "twelve women (γυναῖκες) were called (ἐκλήθησαν) ... The Shepherd commanded (ἐκέλευσε) them to pick up the stones that were thrown out of the building and to bring them away to the mountains". The women are probably "called" by the Shepherd. Cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 403: "Das Passiv 'wurden gerufen' dient zum Auftritt neuer Personen in die visionäre Szene"; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 225: "by whom is not specified". DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 615; BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 403–404; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 225, do not comment on the subordination of the women (in *Sim.* 9,9,5).

77 See *Sim.* 9,5,1 and 9,7,3.

78 See *Sim.* 9,8,2–7 and 9,9,3.

79 Cf. O. LEHTIPUU, *The Example of Thecla and the Example(s) of Paul: Disputing Women's Roles in Early Christianity*, in AHEARNE-KROLL – HOLLOWAY – KELHOFFER, *Women and Gender*, pp. 349–378, p. 352: "... the freedom of women in their social roles was limited and could only be enacted within the bounds of patriarchal structures". Yet, "Upper class women had a certain amount of freedom in the Roman Empire" (p. 326). For the latter, see also HALLETT, *Women's Lives*, p. 31: elite Roman women had a degree of interdependence in marriage. See further TORJESEN, *When Women Were Priests*, p. 61: "According to Roman law, a woman traditionally remained either under the 'power' (*potestas*) of her father or under the 'hand' (*manus*) of her husband". In the second century marriage with *manus* was not the common practice anymore, which increased the independence of married women. Cf. LEIPOLDT, *Frau*, p. 134, who notes that in the early church a prominent role for women was a marginal phenomenon: "länger hält sich die freie Sitte der ältesten Zeit nur am Rande der Kirche und bei den Außenseitern". See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 108.

80 Cf. LEUTZSCH, *Wahrnehmung*, p. 158: "Die Sprache, die Hermas spricht, ist eine Männersprache"; and pp. 159–191, where Leutzsch describes the language in *Hermas* as "androzentrisch".

addressed as men (ἀδελφοί).⁸¹ Broadly speaking, women were probably expected to play a subordinate role.

Concluding Remarks

Hermas shows ambivalent views on women. First, there is the issue of sexuality. The figure Hermas has feelings for his former matron Rhoda (*Vis.* 1,1,1–2), yet envisions an asexual relationship with his wife (*Vis.* 2,2,3). He depicts himself as a family man with a wife and children (*Vis.* 2,2,3), but stresses the preference of a celibate life, which is further emphasized by the fact that problems like adultery and divorce are discussed in detail (*Man.* 4,1,4–8) and that remarriage is not encouraged (*Man.* 4,4,2). He identifies himself as “head of the household” (*Sim.* 7,3), yet fails as *paterfamilias* to keep his wife and children under control (*Vis.* 1,3,1 and 2,3,1). Hermas portrays himself as someone who struggles with his sexual feelings, his Christian conscience (being married yet preferring a celibate life) and socio-cultural expectations (valuing family life, expecting someone to be a successful *paterfamilias*, etc.).

Second, there is female visibility. Hermas’ wife, who is blamed for talking too much (*Vis.* 2,2,3), does not say a word in the whole book. In *Hermas* women are not silenced altogether, but it is only the “visionary” women who speak, not the “real” women of the narrative. Hermas does not encourage women to raise their voice.

Finally, there are gender roles. On the level of the narrative, men have the most important functions. To begin with, there is the family. Hermas is to re-establish his patriarchal authority (*Vis.* 1,3,2 and 2,3,1). Household management is a men’s work: the domestic domain is run by men (*Sim.* 5,2,9 and 7,3). To continue, there is the Christian community. In the church it is the men Hermas and Clement who operate in the public sphere; the woman Grapte presumably in the domestic sphere (*Vis.* 2,4,3). On the “visionary” level of the text it is

81 See esp. *Vis.* 2,4,1; 3,1,1,4; 3,10,3; 4,1,1,5,8 (ἀδελφοί); 3,3,1 (τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς); and *Man.* 8,10 (one of the virtues in the catalogue is “to exercise a brotherly disposition”, ἀδελφότητα συντηρεῖν: cf. 1 Pet 2,17; 5,9; and 1 Clem. 2,4 [ed. EHRMAN], where ἀδελφότης relates to the Christian community). LEUTZSCH, *Wahrnehmung*, pp. 156–159, having investigated the masculine, androcentric group descriptions in *Hermas* (including, but not exclusively, the term ἀδελφοί), concludes that one could speak of “einer teilweise um Weibliches erweiterten androzentrischen Position”. See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 104: “In der Anrede ‘Brüder’ ist erstmals Kontakt mit den Lesern aufgenommen”. Of course, ἀδελφοί may refer to both men and women, but it still stands that women are not explicitly addressed as women.

again men who are in charge. The building of the tower, which represents the (re)formation of the church, is primarily a men's work (*Vis.* 3,2,5; 3,4,1; 3,10,1; *Sim.* 9,3,1; and 9,4,4): women have an assisting role (*Sim.* 9,3,4–5; 9,4,1.3.5.8; 9,5,1; 9,7,3; 9,8,2; and 9,9,5). Only in *Sim.* 9,8,2–7 and 9,9,3 women (παρθέναι) are building the tower, but here the Shepherd is in charge (*Sim.* 9,8,2). The figures Rhoda (*Vis.* 1,1,1) and Grapte (*Vis.* 2,4,3) have an important position in society, respectively in the Christian community, but overall Hermas envisions “traditional” male-centred gender roles.

“Charity”

In more recent literature “charity” in *Hermas* is often interpreted as an expression of sympathy with the needy.¹ Brox, for instance, comments on *Sim.* 9,24,1–3: “Die lauterer Christen . . . sind mitfühlend mit jedem Menschen und geben jedem ohne Vorbehalt und ohne Zögern mit”.² In earlier years the scholarly perspective was different. Dibelius, for example, interprets *Man.* 2,4 not in terms of social help, but as an act of piety.³ And Joly stresses that the theme of neighbourly love is absent in *Hermas*.⁴ In this chapter it will be argued that for *Hermas* it is a pious duty of the rich to support the needy.⁵

- 1 For the sake of convenience, in this chapter the term “charity” (in the sense of the voluntary giving to the needy) will be used. See also, e.g., R. GARRISON, *Redemptive Almsgiving in Early Christianity* (JSNTS, 77), Sheffield, JSOT, 1993, pp. 86–94, who uses the term “charity” frequently for *Hermas*; and D. O’BRIEN, *Entering the Kingdom with Difficulty: The Self-Sufficient Life as the Quest for Wealthy Believers in the Shepherd of Hermas and Clement of Alexandria’s Quis Dives Salvetur and Paedagogus*, in *StPatr* 45 (2010) 325–330, esp. p. 329: “acts of charity”.
- 2 See BROX, *Hirt*, p. 196.
- 3 See DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 500: “die Berufsethik . . . verbindet sich mit dem Frömmigkeitsgebot. Denn als solches ist die Mahnung zum Geben aufzufassen, nicht etwa als Gebot sozialer Hilfeleistung”. See also WEINEL, *Hirt*, p. 302: “Rein religiös, nicht sozial gedacht”. BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 195–196, disagrees with Dibelius: “Der soziale Duktus der Ethik im P[astor]H[ermae] ist hier und in anderen Texten zu deutlich”. It is striking that OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, *passim*, and others read *Hermas* from the perspective of the tradition of the “pious poor” (like DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 555: “Armenfrömmigkeit”), but not from the perspective of, so to say, the “pious rich”, although a few remarks rightly go in this direction: see, e.g., OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, p. 133: “Concern is directed toward the poor only insofar as the rich neglect their *pious duty* toward them” (*italics mine*).
- 4 See JOLY, *Hermas*, p. 45. Cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 515 with n. 5, who argues against Joly that interhuman relationships are an important feature of *Hermas*’ ethics (see further the excursus “Die Ethik”, pp. 512–520); and R.M. THORSTEINSSON, *Roman Christianity and Roman Stoicism: A Comparative Study of Ancient Morality*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010, p. 159: “φιλαδελφία, ‘brotherly love’, . . . is also prominent in the moral teaching of the Christian writings”; with refs. to φιλοξενία (e.g., *Herm. Man.* 38,10 [= 8,10]); φιλόξενος (*id.*; *Sim.* 104,2 [= 9,27,2]); and φιλότεκτος (*Vis.* 3,1 [= 1,3,1]). It should be noted, however, that supporting one another is not necessarily an act of compassion.
- 5 It is scholarly consensus that there were well-to-do members in *Hermas*’ community. See, e.g., DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 528 (on *Man.* 8,10): “Die Aufnahme der sozialen Mahnungen an Besizende zeigt, daß das Christentum nicht mehr reine Armenreligion ist”; p. 552 (on *Sim.* 1,8): “Unsere Stelle ist nur verständlich, wenn es in der Gemeinde Besizende gab,

1 Charity as Pious Duty in the Self-Interest of the Giver

In the *Visions* there are two relevant passages.⁶ In *Vis.* 3,6,6–7 it is stated that wealthy believers (ἔχοντες μὲν πίστιν, ἔχοντες δὲ καὶ πλοῦτον, v. 5), who are symbolized by stones that are white and round, will only be useful (εὐχρηστοί)

bei denen solche Mahnungen Sinn hatten”; p. 555 (“Reiche und Arme bei Hermas”): “Hermas... steht vor der Tatsache, daß sich viele Besitzende in der Gemeinde befinden”; OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, p. 55: “There is no doubt that the rich are members of the community”; p. 89: “the wealthy described by Hermas are clearly insiders”; BROX, *Hirt*, p. 517 (on *Man.* 8,10): “Ein beträchtlicher Teil der römischen Christen muß vermögend gewesen sein”; p. 294 (on *Sim.* 2): “(um) die sozialen Konflikte in der Kirche Roms mit ihren offenbar zahlreichen Reichen... zu lösen”; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 164: “The paraenesis of the chapter is surely addressed primarily to the wealthy, thus indicating a substantial group in the community”.

According to OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, p. 136, the “rich” are in *Hermas* meant to be “members of the lower classes of Rome”. She further notes (p. 127) that the rich “to whom Hermas devotes his attention are not likely to be aristocrats and members of the *ordines*... [but] craftsmen and tradesmen” and that they may have been “lower-class native freeborn” or “foreign freeborn noncitizens”, but were probably freedmen and women (p. 132, see also pp. 134–137): “the concern in the *Shepherd* about wealth and social climbing is best situated as addressed predominantly to a large and influential freedman group in Hermas’ community”.

Osiek (*ibid.*, p. 133) rejects the idea that in *Hermas* the poor are merely literary fiction: “It could almost be said that the poor in *Hermas* appear chiefly for a literary purpose... But to say that the poor are nothing but a literary creation to serve the author’s purpose would be to deny the reality of the social situation in imperial Rome. Even if the impoverished and the needy did not constitute a significant part of Hermas’ community, they were always present in the world around it”. Cf. p. 137, where she concludes that the poor “do not seem to have been a group with large representation in Hermas’ community”. The “needy” include, among others, vulnerable and indigent people (e.g. widows and orphans, *Vis.* 2,4,3, resp. *egeni*, *Vis.* 3,9,3).

- 6 Other passages in the *Visions* are not really related to charity. In *Vis.* 3,10,6 the woman church says to Hermas: “every prayer requires humility: so, fast” (πάσα ἐρώτησις ταπεινοφροσύνης χρῆζει· νήστευσον οὖν). Here ταπεινοφροσύνη is associated with fasting, not (directly) with almsgiving. Pace OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 85: “Ταπεινοφροσύνη (“humbling”), originally associated more with oppressive socio-economic humiliation, has acquired in this vocabulary the sense of mortification, a more general term for a humble attitude that is acted out by prayer, fasting, penance, and almsgiving” (with in n. 11 refs. to *Man.* 4,2,2; *Sim.* 5,3,7; 7,4,6; and 8,7,6). See also OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, p. 66 n. 27. Cf. ZAHN, *Hirt*, p. 364: self-chastisement, as in *Man.* 4,2,2; DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 478: “ταπεινοφροσύνη technisch für Fasten”, as in *Sim.* 5,3,7; R. ARBESMANN, *Fasting and Prophecy in Pagan and Christian Antiquity*, in *Tr.* 7 (1949–1951) 1–71, p. 59: “humility of spirit, acquired by a life of true ascetism”; BROX, *Hirt*, p. 155: “Demutsgeste”; and LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 425 n. 441: “Fasten als ταπεινοφροσύνη”. In *Sim.* 5,3,7 ταπεινοφροσύνη relates to fasting in service of almsgiving, but in other passages there is no evidence that almsgiving is implied.

for the building of the tower and for God (v. 6) if their wealth is chopped off (περικοπή, v. 6), as happened to Hermas (v. 7). It is not explained how the wealth is to be removed. Three possible options are by economic reversal, by confiscation, or by charity.⁷ If charity is indeed implied, it should be noted that the emphasis is on the salvation of the giver.

In *Vis.* 3,9 believers who have more than enough are exhorted to share their food with the have-nots.⁸ What is given comes from God: food belongs to “the things that God created” (τὰ κτίσματα τοῦ θεοῦ, v. 2). Addressed are the haves, not the have-nots: “you who have” (ὁμῖν τοῖς ἔχουσι, v. 4); “you who have more than enough” (οἱ ὑπερέχοντες [. . . ἐκζητεῖτε], v. 5); and “you (ὁμεῖς) who boast of your wealth (ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ ὑμῶν)” (v. 6) are contrasted with “the needy (τοῖς ὑστερουμένοις/οἱ ὑστερούμενοι)” (vv. 2, 4, 6) and “those who are hungry” (τοὺς πεινῶντας, v. 5). Giving to others is not so much a matter of altruism.⁹ It is true that v. 3 states that those who do not have enough food ruin their body, but in v. 4 it is stated that this situation is “harmful for you who have” (βλαβερὰ ὁμῖν τοῖς ἔχουσι). Further, the haves are called to keep the coming judgement (κρίσις) in mind, for once the tower is finished they will no longer have the chance to do well (v. 5) and when the sigh of the poor reaches the Lord they and their goods will be excluded from the tower (v. 6). Being outside the tower means being “out of the eschatological salvation afforded by membership in the church”.¹⁰ In the *Visions* it is the self-interest of the giver that is stressed. This self-interest is mainly described in terms of being worthy to be part of the tower/church.

In the *Mandates* there are two relevant passages.¹¹ In *Man.* 2,4–6 the Shepherd says to Hermas: “give . . . from (the fruits of) your labour . . . to all the destitute”

7 OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, p. 51, mentions only two options: “possibly by ordinary economic reversals or possibly by official confiscation”. See further *Sim.* 9,30,5 and 9,31,2 (below). In *Vis.* 3,6,6–7 it seems that people with wealth cannot be useful for the tower. See also OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, p. 122.

8 It is clear that an internal Christian issue is involved, because the woman church addresses her “children” (τέκνα, v. 1) on how they (should) treat “each other” (ἀλλήλους/ἀλλήλων, v. 2). It is about a just distribution of food, for those who have “much food” (πολλῶν ἐδεσμάτων, v. 3) are contrasted with “those who do not have (enough) food” (μὴ ἐχόντων ἐδεσματα/μὴ ἔχειν τὸ ἀρκετὸν τῆς τροφῆς, v. 3). See esp. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 474–475; BROX, *Hirt*, p. 148; LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 422 n. 396; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 81.

9 Pace BROX, *Hirt*, p. 149: “altruistisches Miteinander”. Cf. OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, p. 47: “the rich are castigated in *Vis.* 3,9 for insensitivity to the poor and for selfishness”.

10 See OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, p. 47.

11 In *Man.* 4,2,2 and *Sim.* 7,4 μετάνοια is connected with humbling (ταπεινῶ) and torturing (βασανίζω) oneself. It has been argued that this involves charity. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 508, interprets πολυτελῶς in *Man.* 4,2,2 (on someone who “richly does what is good”, τὸ ἀγαθὸν

(ἐκ τῶν κόπων σου . . . πᾶσιν ὑστερουμένοις δίδου, v. 4). The motive behind charity is that all possessions are given by God:¹² “God wants his own gifts to be given to all” (πᾶσιν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς δίδοσθαι θέλει ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων δωρημάτων, v. 4).¹³ Charity is a service (διακονία) which one receives from God to perform (v. 6).¹⁴ Direct addressees are the haves: Hermas (“you”, v. 4) and the (individual) giver (ὁ . . . διδούς, v. 6).¹⁵ Objects of charity are “those who take” (οἱ . . . λαμβάνοντες, v. 5). Hermas is called to “give to all the needy generously” (πᾶσιν ὑστερουμένοις δίδου ἀπλῶς, v. 4),¹⁶ “not hesitating to whom you will give and to whom you will

-
- πολυτελῶς ἐργάζεται) as “Wohltätigkeit”; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 114, argues (on the same passage) that if some kind of discipline is intended, “fasting, prayer, and *almsgiving* are probabilities” (italics mine). But even if some kind of penitence is implied (which is disputable, see Chapter 7), it is unlikely that humbling and torturing oneself involve charity.
- 12 See also, e.g., DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 500–501; and LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 423 n. 407 (with refs.). Cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 195 n. 10, who states (on the basis of the idea that wealth is given by God): “Als Möglichkeit der Hilfeleistung freilich ist Besitz frühchristlich immer legitimiert worden”. But cf. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 555 (on James): “die Unverträglichkeit von Reichtum und christlicher Gesinnung”.
- 13 Cf. *Didache* 1,5 (ed. EHRMAN): πᾶσι γὰρ θέλει δίδοσθαι ὁ πατήρ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων χαρισμάτων. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 106 with n. 6, notes that *Man.* 2,4b–6a has “close parallels in *Did.* 1,5”. Yet, there is no sufficient evidence to assume any literary dependence.
- 14 διακονία is “service” to other believers. Cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 195: “διακονία in der Bedeutung von ἐντολή oder ἔργον”; LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 445 n. 29 (ref. to J.N. COLLINS, *Diakonia: Re-interpreting the Ancient Sources*, New York – Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1990, p. 231): “διακονία hier wie sim 1 9; 11 7 als nicht auf Amtsträger beschränkte Aufgabe aller (begüterten) Christen”; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 106: “not office but a special function”.
- 15 ὁ διδούς is read by S A L¹ and L². It is conjectured (by Carlini) that M² (*Papyrus Michigan* 130) read a plural (οἱ οὖν διδόντες). If this conjecture is right, the plural is most likely an adaptation to οἱ οὖν λαμβάνοντες (and the other two plurals λαμβάνοντες) in v. 5 and therefore probably secondary.
- 16 See also DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 500, who interprets ἀπλῶς in the sense of “ohne Rücksicht auf den Empfänger”. See also BAUER – ALAND, *Wörterbuch*, p. 172, who list “rückhaltlos” as a possible meaning of ἀπλῶς (though do not apply this meaning to the passage in *Hermas*); and BROX, *Hirt*, p. 195: “unterschiedslos”. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 196, notes that it is not clear whether the “indiscriminateness” (“Unterschiedslosigkeit”) refers to all people in general, or to community members in particular, yet thinks the first option to be the right one. It is argued that the indiscriminateness marks a difference between the Christian and the Greco-Roman world. See, e.g., J. KABERSCH, *Untersuchungen zum Begriff der Philantropia bei dem Kaiser Julian* (KPS, 21), Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1960, pp. 43–45, who uses *Hermas* (among other early Christian writings) as evidence that, in contrast to pagan thought, “die Christen es [i.e., Wohltätigkeit] wahllos täten, ohne zu prüfen, wer der Hilfe würdig sei” (p. 45); A.R. HANDS, *Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome* (Aspects of Greek and Roman Life), London – Southampton, Thames and Hudson, 1968, esp.

not give" (μὴ διστάζων τίνι δῶς ἢ τίνι μὴ δῶς, v. 4), just "give to all" (πᾶσιν δίδου, v. 4). It is those who receive (οἱ λαμβάνοντες) who are accountable for their action (v. 5). Of those who take (οἱ... λαμβάνοντες), the ones who really are in need (θλιβόμενοι) will not be judged (οὐ δικάσθήσονται), but those who take out of hypocrisy (ἐν ὑποκρίσει) will get punished (τίσουσιν δίκην, v. 5).¹⁷ The one who gives (ὁ... διδοὺς) cannot be blamed (ἀθώρος ἐστίν, v. 6).¹⁸ One is to carry

pp. 74–76, 84–86, 91–92, who contends that in classical literature the emphasis is on giving to those who are deemed to be worthy; P.W. VAN DER HORST, *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides: With Introduction and Commentary* (SVTP, 4), Leiden, Brill, 1978, pp. 129–130, who notes "the difference in valuation of pity and commiseration of the poor between Hellenistic philosophy and Judaism" (p. 129), namely: in the former, pity and commiseration are considered to be vices; LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 445 n. 26: "Hermas' Betonung des unterschiedslosen Gebens... markiert eine Differenz zur paganen Umwelt... Im nichtchristlichen Bereich wurden Auswahlkriterien hochgeschätzt"; and W. SOMMER – D. KLAHR, *Kirchengeschichtliches Repetitorium. Zwanzig Grundkapitel der Kirchen-, Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte* (UTB, 1796), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002³, p. 11: "Die christliche Hilfe gegenüber dem Nächsten hob sich vor der antiken Wohltätigkeit ab". Cf. A. DIHLE, *Die Goldene Regel. Eine Einführung in die Geschichte der antiken und frühchristlichen Vulgärethik* (SAW, 7), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962, p. 109 n. 2, who stresses: "auch in christlichen Texten [gibt es] die Mahnung, vor der Gabe sehr genau die Würdigkeit des Empfängers zu prüfen".

- 17 Cf. LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 445 n. 27: "Vorausgesetzt ist mangelnde Verhaltenstransparenz wie auch sonst bei Hermas". Leutzsch's examples (e.g., *Man.* 3,3) indicate that his interpretation means that one does not always know how a person really is, even if one knows him or her. Another option is, however, that what is at stake here is that a giver does not always know the receiver very well.
- 18 The plural, which is attested in M² (οἱ οὖν διδόντες ἀθῶοι) [ἐῖσιν], is probably secondary (see above). *Man.* 2,6 is referred to in discussions on possible literary relationships between *Hermas*, the *Didache* and Luke-Acts. Cf. *Did.* 1,5 (ed. EHRMAN): μακάριος ὁ διδοὺς κατὰ τὴν ἐντολὴν ἀθῶος γὰρ ἐστίν. According to OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 106 n. 6, ἐντολή may refer to Luke 6,30, Acts 20,35 or *Man.* 2. But in Luke ("give to anyone who begs you"; see also Matt 5,42), the initiative comes from the one who asks. Acts ("it is more blessed to give than to receive") is about a different topic. And any literary dependence between *Hermas* and the *Didache* has never been convincingly demonstrated. *Did.* 1,5 is more closely related to Luke and Matthew than to *Hermas*. For the agreements between *Man.* 2,6 and *Did.* 1,5, see, e.g., T. ZAHN, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur*. III, Erlangen – Leipzig, Deichert, 1884, pp. 316–319, who thinks that the author of the *Didache* knew *Herm.* *Man.* 2,4–6; A. STAHL, *Patristische Untersuchungen. Der "Hirt" des Hermas*, Leipzig, Deichert, 1901, pp. 223–359, pp. 278–285, who believes that *Hermas* is literarily dependent on the *Didache*; DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 500, who argues that *Hermas* and *Did.* 1,5 derive from the same source; H. KOESTER, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern* (TU, 65 = 5,10), Berlin, Akademie, 1957, pp. 230–237, who contends that the authors of the *Didache*, *Didascalía* and *Hermas* used the same (literary) source; J.-P. AUDET, *La Didachè. Instructions des Apôtres*, Paris, Gabalda, 1958, pp. 163–166,

out the service (διακονία) of giving generously (ἀπλῶς), without distinguishing to whom one does and to whom one does not give (v. 6). The service is to be carried out generously (διακονία . . . ἀπλῶς . . . ἀπλῶς διακονῶν, v. 6). As the rhetoric indicates, Hermas tries to convince the haves that they should give generously without asking themselves whether their gifts go to the right people.¹⁹ Giving is a good deed (ἐργάζου τὸ ἀγαθόν, v. 4), a service (διακονία) which brings the giver closer to God: if it is carried out generously (ἀπλῶς), it is honourable for God (ἐνδοξος παρὰ τῷ θεῷ); the one who carries it out generously (ἀπλῶς) will live to God (τῷ θεῷ ζήσεται, v. 6).²⁰

According to *Man.* 8,10, God's servants (v. 6) should (among other things) “help widows, visit orphans and needy people, rescue God's servants from distress” (χήραις ὑπηρετεῖν καὶ ὀρφάνους καὶ ὑστερουμένους ἐπισκέπτεσθαι, ἐξ ἀναγκῶν λυτροῦσθαι τοὺς δούλους τοῦ θεοῦ) and “should not put pressure on debtors and needy people” (χρεώστας μὴ θλίβειν καὶ ἐνδεεῖς).²¹ The Shepherd mentions these good deeds (τῶν ἀγαθῶν τὰ ἔργα, v. 8) in reaction to Hermas’

who considers *Hermas* to have been influenced by the *Didache* (“l’auteur [*Hermas*] est sous l’influence du texte de la *Didachè*, qu’il utilise de mémoire” [p. 165]); NIEDERWIMMER, *Didache*, pp. 108–109, who uses the term “agreement” (“Übereinstimmung”) rather than “dependence” (“Abhängigkeit”); BROX, *Hirt*, p. 195: “Abhängigkeit der *Didache* außer von Mt, Lk und Sir auch vom P[astor]H[ermae] ist denkbar, aber nicht zwingend”; p. 196: the “most plausible” explanation is that the authors of the *Didache* and of *Hermas* used the same source or tradition: the Didachist reacted on an existing misuse (“Mißbrauch”) in the community; Hermas knew about misuse, but aspired to “die Einschärfung der sozialen Pflicht als wesentlich christlicher Forderung”; and J. SCHRÖTER, *Jesus Tradition in Matthew, James, and the Didache: Searching for Characteristic Emphases*, in VAN DE SANDT – ZANGENBERG (eds.), *Matthew, James, and Didache*, pp. 233–255, pp. 250–251, who concludes that the authors of the *Didache* and *Hermas* had their own access to early Christian traditions.

- 19 See also, e.g., OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 105: “the problem of giving to those who might be deemed unworthy to receive”. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 106: “the *Didache* passage seems more concerned with an actual abusive situation”. Hermas may indeed not deal with an “abusive” situation, but still seems to respond to an “actual” problem.
- 20 DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 501, comments: “dem Leistungsgedanken entspricht der hier stark ‘altkatholische’ Lohngedanke”. Cf. the (somewhat puzzling) interpretation of OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 106: “the principles laid down here spring not so much directly from social concern as from the traditional obligation of those who can give to the needy, and the necessity of giving alms for the life of faith . . . but of course, the responsibility of those who can give is part of the larger plan of help for those who need it”.
- 21 For the rendering “needy”, see also ZAHN, *Hirt*, p. 102 (“ärmer”); OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, pp. 64–67; and EAD., *Shepherd*, p. 130 (“poorer”). Pace DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 528: “ἐνδεής ist nicht ‘arm’, sondern . . . ‘niedrig’ zu übersetzen”, as in L¹ L² (*humilior*) and in *Man.* 11,8; and BROX, *Hirt*, p. 235 (“geringer”). It is more likely that debtors and the needy are meant, than debtors and the humble.

question what he should do in order to be saved (σωθῆναι, v. 8). He concludes that Hermas and all who do these things will live to God (ζήσῃ τῷ θεῷ thrice, vv. 11–12; ζήσονται τῷ θεῷ, v. 12).²² In the *Mandates* it is again the self-interest of the giver that is stressed. This self-interest is mainly expressed in terms of being honourable (ἐνδοξος) for God and being worthy to live (ζητεῖν) and to be saved (σωθῆναι).

There are several text-critical problems (see esp. LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, pp. 218–219), of which some important ones will shortly be discussed here. χήραις ὀπηρετεῖν^{ο1} καὶ ὀρφάνους^{ο2} καὶ ὑστερουμένους^{ο1} ἐπισκέπτεσθαι, ἐξ ἀναγκῶν^{ο2} λυτρώσθαι^{ο1} τοὺς δούλους τοῦ θεοῦ . . . χρεώστας μὴ θλίβειν^{ο2} καὶ ἐνδεεῖς^{ο1}.^ο *om.* C^s: the reading of C^s (“widows and orphans and needy”) is smoother and therefore probably secondary (*txt* WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN).^{ο1} *om.* A Ant (= Antiochos) L¹ and L²: the reading without καὶ is smoother and therefore most likely secondary: “to help widows, to visit orphans and needy people, to rescue . . .” (*txt* LEUTZSCH; pace WHITTAKER; JOLY; and EHRMAN). ὀρφανοῖς Ath¹ (= Pseudo-Athanasius in *Codex Guelpherbytanus*) and E: this dative is probably influenced by the dative χήραις and therefore likely to be secondary (*txt* WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN). *et honora* E: this reading seems to be a paraphrase (*txt* WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN).^{ο2} *om.* Ath² (= Pseudo-Athanasius in *Codex Parisinus Graecus*) and Ant: “to visit needy orphans” is probably secondary, because it makes the reading smoother by doing away with καὶ (see also ^{ο1}) (*txt* WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN).^{ο1} *txt* A Ath¹ Ath² Ant and C^s, ἐπισκέψα[σ]θαί P (= *Papyrus Prague*): the witnesses for *txt* form a stronger combination than for the aorist (P) (*txt* WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN).^{ο2} *txt* P A C^s Ath¹ and Ath², λυτρώσασθαι Ant: the witnesses for *txt* form a stronger combination than for the aorist (Ant) (*txt* WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN).^{ο1} τοῖς δούλοις Ath¹: this reading is smoother because of the four datives (χήραις, ὀρφανοῖς, ὑστερουμένοις, δούλοις) and therefore probably secondary (*txt* WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN).^{ο2} *txt* A, ἐνδεεῖς Ant, ἐνδεεῖς μὴ λυπεῖν Ath (E), ἐνδεεῖς ὄντας C^s, *om.* L¹ L²: καὶ ἐνδεεῖς at the end of the phrase is somewhat confusing; it seems that this problem was solved in three different ways: by adding μὴ λυπεῖν (similar to χρεώστας μὴ θλίβειν), by turning ἐνδεεῖς into an adjective or specification (i.e., the debtors are specified as debtors *who are in need*), or by omitting the words altogether. For these reasons, the reading of A is to be preferred (*lectio difficilior*) (*txt* WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN).

- 22 Cf. *Man.* 8,3—believers (“God’s servants”, v. 4) are to “abstain . . . from [among other things] . . . luxurious wealth” (ἐγκρατεῦεσθαι . . . ἀπὸ . . . πολυτέλειας πλούτου). Otherwise they “cannot live to God” (οὐ δύναται ζῆσαι τῷ θεῷ, v. 4). OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 129, notes that (part of) this verse refers to “lack of charity”. If charity is indeed implied (which remains uncertain), it should be noted that the self-interest of those who give is stressed (v. 4).

J. REILING, *Herms and Christian Prophecy: A Study of the Eleventh Mandate* (NT.S, 37), Leiden, Brill, 1973, p. 49 n. 5, thinks that becoming ἐνδεέστερον than all people in *Man.* 8,10 and 11,8 means voluntary poverty. But this is unlikely. See esp. *Sim.* 9,30,5: the wealth of the rich is not to be cut off completely, for the rest is to be used to support the poor. The ideal is not to become poor, but to share one’s wealth with the needy.

In the *Similitudes* there are ten relevant passages. In *Sim.* 1,8–9 believers (ὁμοῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ, v. 1) who are wealthy (τὸν πλοῦτον ὑμῶν, v. 8), having possessions (v. 8) like fields (vv. 1, 4–5, 8), expensive possessions (v. 1), houses (vv. 1, 4, 8) and many other things (vv. 4–5), are exhorted to “buy suffering souls” (ἀγοράζετε ψυχὰς θλιβομένας), to take care of (ἐπισκέπτεσθε) widows and orphans and to use their wealth and all their possessions for these kind of purposes (v. 8). Riches are given by God (v. 8).²³ Charity is an act of piety: “for therefore the Master has made you rich, so that you would fulfil these services *for Him*” (εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐπλούτισεν ὑμᾶς ὁ δεσπότης, ἵνα ταύτας τὰς διακονίας τελέσητε αὐτῷ, v. 9).²⁴ The focus is on the giver’s salvation (σωθήσῃ, v. 11).²⁵

Sim. 2,4–10: in Christian circles (“the parable is about the servants of God, poor and rich”, v. 4),²⁶ a rich man (ὁ πλούσιος, vv. 4–7) is to share his wealth (χρήματα/τὸ πλοῦτος, vv. 5, 7) with a poor man (ὁ πτωχός, v. 4; ὁ πένης, vv. 5–7) by providing, or carrying the costs of ([ἐπι]χορηγέω, vv. 5–8)²⁷ the necessary

23 OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 159, rightly states: “The preferred use of money is works of charity, by which wealth given by God is used in the intended way”. See further BROX, *Hirt*, p. 518, who argues that wealth is unproblematic, because it is given by God: what matters is that it is used in the right way, namely by sharing it with the needy.

24 BROX, *Hirt*, p. 288, rightly notes: “Gott schenkt Reichtum... damit man ihm in der Armensorge dienen... kann”. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 160, does not comment on the fact that these services are *for Him*. In *Rich and Poor*, p. 54, she writes on *Sim.* 1,9: “The very reason for the possession of wealth by individuals is that it might be used to accomplish charitable deeds”. *Sim.* 1,9 does, however, not refer to “charitable deeds”, but to services for God. The reading αὐτῷ forms an important text-critical problem. It is attested in A, but not in L¹ L² and E. The reading of A is to be preferred (WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN). It is more likely that αὐτῷ was omitted than that it was added. Grammatically, the word is superfluous. Moreover, the shorter reading (“so that you would fulfill these services”) is easier than the longer one (“so that you would fulfill these services αὐτῷ”).

25 σωθήσῃ is attested in A L¹ and L², but E reads *vives* (ζήσῃ): the reading of E is probably secondary (with WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN), because it is more likely that “you will be saved” was changed into the frequently repeated formula “you will live (to God)” than vice versa.

26 See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 293 (“Konflikt zwischen armen und reichen Christen in Rom”).

27 In *Sim.* 2,7 ταύτην [ἐντευξίς] ἀποδίδωσι τῷ κυρίῳ τῷ ἐπιχορηγοῦντι αὐτῷ, the last phrase (“to the one who supports him”) probably refers to the giver. See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 290: “er gibt es [das Gebet] dem Herrn zurück zugunsten dessen, der ihn versorgt”. Cf. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 556–557, who translates: “das [Beten] hat er vom Herrn empfangen und das gibt er dem Herrn, der’s ihm verlieh, wieder”, and interprets: “das Gebet selbst aber ist eine Rückgabe der also verliehenen Gnade an Gott”; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 161: “and returns it [i.e., the prayer of intercession] to the Lord who sustains him or her”. Cf. further LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 249: “Dies [Bittgebet] übergibt er dem Herrn, der ihn unterstützt”.

things (τὰ δέοντα, vv. 5, 8) without hesitation (ἀδιστάκτως, vv. 5, 7).²⁸ The poor man, in his turn, intercedes on behalf of his benefactor (vv. 5–8). Wealth derives from the Lord (vv. 7, 10).²⁹ Charity is a great deed (v. 7) and service (διακονία, v. 7; διακονῆσαι, v. 10). It involves reciprocity: rich and poor work together (ἀμφοτέροι, vv. 7, 9; κοινωνοί, v. 9). Yet, within this reciprocal relationship the focus is primarily on the rich.³⁰ It is in the self-interest of the rich to give to the poor.³¹ Both parties benefit from each other, but the poor only benefit in a material way:³² it is the rich who come closer to God.³³ The vine gives “double fruit” (διπλοῦν τὸν καρπὸν, v. 8), namely for itself and for the elm. Most likely, the vine stands for the rich and the elm for the poor.³⁴ It is striking that

Leutzsch's translation is ambivalent, because “Herr” can refer to the Lord as well as to the giver.

28 See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 163 n. 17 (“without hesitation or doubt”).

29 See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 295.

30 See also OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, pp. 87–88; and EAD., *Shepherd*, p. 164: “The paraenesis of the chapter is surely addressed primarily to the wealthy”. Cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 297, who comments that the parenetic message does not seem to be directed at the poor, but adds that because of the “reciprocal structure” the poor are addressed as well.

31 See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 163: “There is certainly an appeal to the self-interest of the rich here”. See also her *Rich and Poor*, p. 86: “when the rich person relies upon the poor (for intercession) and supplies what he needs, he believes that what is done to the poor will find its reward before God”.

OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, pp. 79–83; and EAD., *Shepherd*, p. 164 n. 24, mentions 1 *Clem.* 38,2 as a close parallel, where the rich one (ὁ πλούσιος) is exhorted to support (ἐπιχορηγέτω) the poor (τῷ πτωχῷ), and the poor one (ὁ... πτωχός) is exhorted to give thanks to God (εὐχαριστεῖτω τῷ θεῷ) because God has given him someone through whom he is supported. But an important difference between 1 *Clem.* and *Herm.* is that only the latter develops the idea of the self-interest of the rich.

32 See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 294: “die materielle Unterstützung der Armen durch die Reichen”.

33 Pace *ibid.*, p. 295: “H[ermas] verrät eine eindeutige Parteilichkeit zugunsten der Armen, die er reich und fruchtbar vor Gott nennt, wogegen die Reichen arm und armselig dastehen... Die Reichen sind ohne die Armen viel schlechter dran als die Armen ohne die Reichen. H[ermas] nimmt eine völlige Ungleichbewertung vor und stellt sich mit seiner ganzen Diktion klar auf die Seite der Armen”. But it is the opposite that should be stressed here: Hermas primarily addresses the rich (see also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 297). The rich are exhorted to give to the poor so that the needy will receive the material support they need and the rich will come closer to God. It is the rich who benefit the most of the mutual relationship. See also OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, p. 133; in *Sim.* 2 (v. 10) “the final focus is on the blessedness of the wealthy who understand the right way to use the gifts God has given them”.

34 See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 296. But the majority position is that the elm symbolizes the rich and the vine the poor. OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, p. 86; and EAD., *Shepherd*, p. 163 with n. 11,

the first fruit is for the vine itself (ὕπερ ἑαυτῆς, v. 8). By giving, the rich person gives fruit to himself (the poor person's prayer of intercession on his behalf) and to the poor (material support).³⁵

Sim. 5,2,9: charity means here giving others food that one does not need oneself.³⁶ The master of the slave who took care of his vineyard prepares a banquet (δεῖπνον) and sends his slave much food (ἐδέσματα . . . πολλά) from it. The slave only keeps what he needs (τὰ ἀρκοῦντα) and divides the rest among his fellow-slaves. What follows (over)emphasizes the slave's reward: his fellow-slaves intercede on his behalf (v. 10),³⁷ his master is happy about his deed (v. 11) and his master's friends and son fully agree that he becomes joint heir with the son (v. 11). Generosity is in the self-interest of the giver.

Sim. 5,3,7: the Shepherd explains to Hermas that on a day of fasting he should taste only bread and water, oversee (συνοψίσας)³⁸ the amount of money (τὴν ποσότητα τῆς δαπάνης) he was going to spend that day on food, and give it to a widow, orphan or needy person. True fasting is a duty, a fulfilment of God's commandments (vv. 5–6).³⁹ The aim of fasting is not so much almsgiving

argues that the text is ambivalent and that it is not the exact correlation of symbols, but the mutual dependence of rich and poor that matters.

35 OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, p. 86, interprets the vine's "double fruit" as "material support not only for themselves [i.e., the wealthy] but also for the poor", but rejects this view later on, because she understands the elm to be the rich and the vine the poor (pp. 86, 89). But it is difficult to see how the poor would give double fruit. Moreover, the double fruit does not necessarily refer to two ways of *material* support.

36 DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 563, focuses primarily on the theological implications. He wonders, for instance, why the slave is not yet "Tischgenosse" of his master. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 171, notes that the fact that the master sends food to the slave is "not a gesture of condescension, but of honor to a social inferior". Her comment seems to be an implicit reaction to Dibelius. See further BROX, *Hirt*, p. 311: "Erfüllung der sozialen Pflicht mit Hilfe des Reichtums". Here Brox rightly uses the term "Pflicht" ("duty") instead of "Engagement" (p. 451). OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 171, writes further that the slave's generosity is "after the manner of unanimous Jewish-Christian social teaching to share with the needy". She (p. 172) rightly notes that here (as in *Sim.* 1,6) the believer is expected to keep only what s/he needs and to give the rest to those who need it.

37 See also *Sim.* 2, where the rich support the poor who, in their turn, intercede on behalf of the rich.

38 συνοψίσας is read by M, A and F (= *Florilegium patristicum*). Ath² reads συμψηφίσας ("to calculate"), but this reading is probably secondary (with WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN), because συνοψίσας is the *lectio difficilior* (because "to calculate" fits the context better) and has the strongest manuscript evidence.

39 See also DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 566: "die Erfüllung der Pflichtleistung d. h. die Erfüllung der Gebote Gottes".

(“ethics”) as coming closer to God (“piety”).⁴⁰ It is true that v. 7 reads “so that . . . the one who receives satisfies his hunger” (ὅνα . . . ὁ εἰληφώς ἐμπλήσῃ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν),⁴¹ but the emphasis is on the one who gives:⁴² the receiver will intercede on behalf of his benefactor (v. 7), the offer (θυσία) of the giver will be welcome for God, the fasting will be recorded, the service (λειτουργία) is good, joyful and pleasant for God (v. 8), and all who keep these things will be happy and will receive everything they ask the Lord (v. 9).

Sim. 9,20,2 is about wealthy believers (οἱ πιστεύσαντες, v. 1; τοῖς δούλοις τοῦ θεοῦ, v. 2): “the rich (οἱ . . . πλούσιοι) hardly cohere to⁴³ the servants of God, being afraid that they will be begged for something by them (φοβούμενοι μή τι αἰτισθῶσιν ὑπ’ αὐτῶν).”⁴⁴ Hermas’ point is that for wealthy believers who use to keep away from the less-fortunate it is difficult to enter God’s kingdom (v. 3), but that, when they change (μετανοήσωσι) and do something good they will live to God (v. 4).

In *Sim.* 9,24,2 believers (πιστεύσαντες, v. 1)⁴⁵ who “from (the fruits of) their labour supported everyone” (ἐκ τῶν κοπῶν αὐτῶν παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐχορήγησαν, v. 2) set an example.⁴⁶ The Lord “made them prosper in (the fruits of) the labour of their hands and bestowed favour on them in every activity of theirs” (ἐπλήθυνεν αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς κόποις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐχαρίτωσεν αὐτοὺς ἐν πάσῃ πράξει αὐτῶν, v. 3). It has been argued that this is about “increasing social

40 Pace *ibid.*, p. 567: “Gerechtfertigt wird sie [Askese] durch ihre Unterstellung unter den sittlichen Zweck des Almosengebens”. Dibelius (referring to Paul) interprets the fasting as “freiwillige Enthaltung aus Liebe zum Bruder”.

41 For the (free) translation “satisfies his hunger”, see also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 313: “physisches Sättigen”; LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 472 n. 90: “physische Sättigung wie Prov 6, 30”; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 174: “physical nurture”. For the reference to Prov 6,30 (LXX), see already DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 567 (ἐμπλήσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν πεινῶν). But Dibelius translates “seine Seele sättigen”.

42 Pace OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 174, who speaks of a “focus of the outcome of ascetism on the needy (v. 7)”.

43 BROX, *Hirt*, p. 446, rightly interprets this in the sense of keeping in touch with the community (“Kontakt zur Gemeinde”).

44 Here Hilgenfeld’s conjecture αἰτισθῶσιν ὑπ’ (“they are begged by . . .”) on the basis of L¹ L² (E) is accepted (with WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN). A reads αἰτιαθῶσιν ἅπ’ (“they are accused by . . .”).

45 See BROX, *Hirt*, p. 449: “Christen”.

46 παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ is read by A and L² (and accepted by WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN), but L¹ and E read πάντιν ἀνθρώποις. In the preceding part of the same verse, A reads πάντα ἀνθρώπων, whereas L¹ L² and E read πάντας ἀνθρώπους. It is more likely that the singular was changed into the plural than vice versa, because plural nouns, verbs, adjectives, etc. are used throughout the rest of the sentence (exception: the Holy Spirit).

engagement”.⁴⁷ It is indeed stated that those involved “were always merciful” (πάντοτε σπλάγγχον ἔχοντες) to everyone. It should be noted, however, that right after v. 3 the Shepherd promises the addressees (“you”, ὑμῖν): “your offspring (σπέρμα) will never be swept away . . . the Lord inscribed you into our number [i.e., among the angels] and all your offspring will live with the Son of God” (v. 4).⁴⁸ The emphasis is again on the reward for the giver.

In *Sim.* 9,27,2 the following believers (πιστεύσαντες, v. 1) set an example: “bishops (ἐπίσκοποι) and hospitable people (φιλόξενοι) who were always happy to receive (ὑπεδέξαντο) servants of God into their houses . . . the bishops always protected (ἐσκέπασαν) the needy (τοὺς ὑστερημένους) and the widows (τὰς χήρας) in their service (τῇ διακονίᾳ).”⁴⁹ Those who do such things will always be protected (σκεπασθήσονται) by the Lord, are honourable (ἐνδοξοί) for God, and their place is with the angels (v. 3).

According to *Sim.* 9,30,5, the Lord commanded that the wealth (*opes*) of rich believers, symbolized by round and shining stones, was cut off, not completely, but partly, so that the rich could use the rest to do well (*possint aliquid boni facere*) and live to God (*viverent deo*). After they were hewn (*circumcisi*), they were placed in the tower.⁵⁰

Sim. 9,31,2: of other round stones the wealth is to be cut off (*circumcidi*) as well, so that they come into God’s kingdom (*in dei regnum convenient*).⁵¹ Again, the emphasis is on the giver’s reward.

Finally, *Sim.* 10,4: object of charity is every human who is in need and necessity (*omnem hominem . . . incommodo . . . in magno tormento et necessitate*, v. 2; *angustiam*, v. 3). Someone who is tormented by his needs (*incommodo vexatur*), is tortured (*cruciat*) like someone who is imprisoned (v. 3). Many who cannot endure the vexation (*vexationem*) commit suicide (v. 3). The distress of the needy is taken into account, but doing well is mainly a matter of self-interest: the one who keeps God’s commandments will live (*vivit*) and be

47 See BROX, *Hirt*, p. 451: “zu gesteigertem sozialem Engagement”.

48 DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 632, uses the word “beneficence” (“Wohltätigkeit”) for this passage and sees the “reward” (“Belohnung”) of the pious as “success in business affairs” (“geschäftlicher Erfolg”). BROX, *Hirt*, p. 450, interprets σπέρμα here as “spiritual offspring” (“geistliche . . . Nachkommenschaft der Frommen”). OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 248, thinks that activities in general or businesses in particular may be meant. Cf. LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 494 n. 418: “Die Verheißung ewiger Nachkommenschaft erinnert an die Väterverheißungen der Gen, ohne dort ein genaues Analogon zu haben”.

49 OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 250, states that two kinds of hospitality are described: “reception of travellers [i.e., Christians travelling from elsewhere] and charity to the local needy”.

50 See further *Vis.* 3,6,6–7 and *Sim.* 9,31,2.

51 See further *Vis.* 3,6,6–7 and *Sim.* 9,30,5.

happy (*felix erit*, v. 1). Good deeds are useful for oneself (*qui . . . bonam operam exercere. utile est illis*, v. 2).⁵² By rescuing someone who is in need, one acquires great joy for oneself (*magnum sibi gaudium adquiret*, v. 3). It is “you who have received (*accepistis*)” from the Lord who should do well before the building of the tower is finished: “it is for your sake (*propter vos*)” that the building has been interrupted (v. 4).⁵³

In the *Similitudes* the self-interest of the giver is explained in similar ways as in the *Visions* and *Mandates*, but several other aspects are added. As in the *Visions*, supporting the needy helps the giver to become worthy of being part of the tower/church. As in the *Mandates*, the giver becomes honourable (ἐνδοξος) for God and worth to live (ζητεῖν) and to be saved (σωθῆναι). In the *Similitudes* it is added that helping the needy is a welcome offer that pleases God, that it gives joy to the giver, that one's deeds will be recorded, that the receiver will intercede on one's behalf, that one will receive everything one asks the Lord, that one's offspring will live forever, that one will get a place among the angels and that one will enter God's kingdom.

In *Hermas* charity is not so much a matter of empathy as of piety. Words like συμπάθειω, φιλαδελφία, or φιλανθρωπία do not occur and ἀγάπη is not used in the sense of doing charitable deeds out of neighbourly love. Furthermore, in several instances where one would expect *Hermas* to stress the social aspects of helping others, he does not do so: when hungry people are suffering, it is harmful *for the haves* (*Vis.* 3,9,4); supporting the poor is a service *for the Lord* (*Sim.* 1,9); helping the needy is useful *for those who do such good deeds* (*Sim.* 10,4,2), etc. For *Hermas*, it is the pious duty of the haves to support the have-nots. Charity is a matter of course.⁵⁴ *Hermas* exhorts rich believers to use

52 *bonam operam* is attested in L². L¹ reads *bona opera*, E *bonum*. The reading of E is smoother than that of the others (*recte facere . . . bonum exercere*) and, therefore, probably secondary. It is difficult to decide between the Latin versions. The reading of L² is accepted by WHITTAKER and LEUTZSCH, but EHRLICH reads *bona opera*.

53 DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 643–644; and LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, pp. 496–497, do not note the self-interest of doing well. But cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 470 (on *Sim.* 10,4,3): “H[ermas] betont im Zusammenhang der sozialen Frage regelmäßig den soteriologischen Nutzen für den Geber”. Cf. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 261, on *Sim.* 10,4,1–3: “The reason for doing good deeds is not so much self-improvement or salvation, but the imperative . . . to relieve the suffering of others. The by-product, however, is joy . . .”, but on *Sim.* 10,4,4–5: “Verse 4 returns to the more typical Greco-Roman self-interest as motive for doing good”.

54 For a similar idea, see, e.g., Philo, *Somn.* 1,98 (ed. SAVINEL). Aim of Philo's ethics is unification of the individual with God. When Philo substantiates his ethics, he refers to the self-interest of the individual and not to feelings of empathy with others. For a decent person,

their wealth to help the needy.⁵⁵ Only the haves are directly addressed; the needy remain in the background.⁵⁶ Hermas is first and foremost concerned with the change (μετάνοια) of the rich and only secondarily and indirectly with the poor.⁵⁷

Concluding Remarks

For Hermas, charity is not so much an act of social help out of altruism, compassion or sympathy with the needy as an act of piety. It is a pious duty: all wealth is given by God (*Vis.* 3,9,2; *Man.* 2,4; *Sim.* 1,8; and 2,7,10) and "God wants his own gifts to be given to all" (*Man.* 2,4). Charity is for God's sake (*Sim.* 1,9). It brings the giver somehow closer to God (*Man.* 2,6; 8,11–12; *Sim.* 5,3,8–9; 9,20,4; 9,27,3; and 9,30,5). The focus is on the salvation of the giver (*Sim.* 1,11) in view of the coming judgement (*Vis.* 3,9,5). Good deeds are useful for oneself (*Sim.* 10,4,2–4): the well-to-do are admonished to give for charity, so that the receivers may intercede on their behalf (*Sim.* 2,5–8; 5,2,10; and 5,3,7) and they themselves may become useful for the tower (*Vis.* 3,6,6; *Sim.* 9,30,5; and 10,4,4), they and their offspring may flourish (*Sim.* 9,24,3–4), their place may be with the angels (*Sim.* 9,27,3) and they may enter God's kingdom (*Sim.* 9,20,3 and 9,31,2).

it is self-evident to help the needy. In her study on philanthropy in Philo, K. BERTHELOT, *Philanthrôpia judaica. Le débat autour de la "misanthropie" des lois juives dans l'Antiquité* (JSJ.S, 76), Leiden, Brill, 2003, does not mention *Somn.* 1,98.

- 55 See also, e.g., OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, p. 52: "In most contexts... there is no suggestion that they [the wealthy] cannot remain rich"; p. 87 (on *Sim.* 2): "There is no condemnation of the wealthy for their conduct, nor are they expected to divest themselves of their wealth except by using it in the right way"; BROX, *Hirt*, p. 149 (on *Vis.* 3,9,3): "H[ermas] empfiehlt... Almosen... und verlangt nicht Verteilung zu gleichem Besitz"; and p. 296 (on *Sim.* 2,7): "nicht... [die] Abschaffung der Armut. Die Lose der Armen und Reichen werden in der Parabel als gegebene Rollen hingenommen und nicht als Unrecht kritisiert".
- 56 See OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, p. 55: "Direct address is used only to the rich... the poor are referred to in the third person as recipients". See further esp. p. 40: in *Hermas* there are fewer terms for the poor than for the rich; p. 41: apart from *Sim.* 2, the poor are only mentioned "as objects of oppression by church officials (*Sim.* 9,26,2), as counterpart of the general readership of the book (*Man.* 8,10; *Vis.* 3,9), or as objects of charity (*Vis.* 3,9,2; *Man.* 8,10; *Sim.* 1,8; 5,3,7; 9,27,2)"; and p. 132 n. 142: "*Hermas* does not represent the perspective of the 'have-nots'".
- 57 See also OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, p. 133: "economic poverty and the plight of the poor were not major concerns of Hermas".

Baptism and *Metanoia*

In *Hermas* baptism and μετάνοια are closely related.¹ The relation between the two is most clearly expressed in *Man.* 4,3. Baptism signifies forgiveness (ἄφεσις) of one's previous sins (v. 1). One who has received forgiveness, should sin no more (v. 2). But a baptized believer who has sinned, has one chance to change (μίαν μετάνοιαν, v. 6). After that, one should sin no more (μηκέτι προσθήσω ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις, v. 7). It is explicitly stated that this second chance should not be "an excuse (ἀφορμή) for those who will believe or just have come to believe in the Lord. For those who have just come to believe or will believe do not have μετάνοια of sins (μετάνοιαν ἁμαρτιῶν), but forgiveness of their previous sins (ἄφεσιν... τῶν προτέρων ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν)" (v. 3).² For *Hermas*, baptism is the sign of a believer's initial conversion and μετάνοια one other chance to change for a believer who has sinned. *Hermas* warns the non-baptized that they have only one opportunity to convert and at the same time reassures baptized believers who have sinned that they do have another chance.³ What follows aims to show that *Hermas*' focus is not on baptizing outsiders, but on changing insiders.⁴

1 An earlier version of this chapter was published as M. GRUNDEKEN, *Baptism and Μετάνοια in the Shepherd of Hermas*, in ID. – VERHEYDEN (eds.), *Early Christian Communities*, pp. 127–142. I thank Mohr Siebeck for permission to include the article here.

2 According to BROX, *Hirt*, p. 100, *Hermas* means that outsiders after baptism do have a second chance. Cf. BLOMKVIST, *Teaching on Baptism*, p. 855, who notes that μετάνοιαν ἁμαρτιῶν refers to future sins, committed after baptism.

3 OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 29, states: "Hermas attempts to hold in tension the ideal that there be no necessity of forgiveness after baptism with the reality that there is". See also E. OSBORN, *Geleitwort*, in A. SCHNEIDER, *"Propter sanctam ecclesiam suam". Die Kirche als Geschöpf, Frau und Bau im Bußunterricht des Pastor Hermas* (SEAug, 67), Rome, Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1999, p. 7: "What must be done when those, who have through baptism shared in the eschatological miracle, continue to sin, either monotonously or spectacularly? Hermas is concerned with this issue". Hermas uses two pedagogical tools: he warns the non-baptized that they have only one opportunity to convert and he reassures baptized believers who have sinned that they do have another chance, but not more than one. For the idea that *Hermas*' message of no-conversion was intended for catechumens, and the message of μετάνοια for baptized sinners, see, e.g., POSCHMANN, *Paenitentia secunda*, pp. 165–166; and, more recently, HENNE, *L'unité*, pp. 91–139, esp. pp. 138–139.

4 See also PERNVEDEN, *Concept of the Church*, p. 164: *Hermas*' focus is not on how people "were going to become Christians, but how they were to remain such"; and BLOMKVIST,

1 Baptism

In *Hermas* baptism is described in the usual way of going down into the water and (fortunately!) coming up again (ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ, *Vis.* 3,2,9; εἰς ὕδωρ κατέβημεν, *Man.* 4,3,1; δι' ὕδατος ἀναβῆναι, *Sim.* 9,16,2; εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ... καταβαίνουσι...καὶ ἀναβαίνουσι, v. 4; κατέβησαν...εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ πάλιν ἀνέβησαν, v. 6). There are about a dozen baptismal allusions. A first one is found in *Vis.* 3,2,9.⁵ It is part of *Hermas*' first vision of the tower (which started in v. 4). *Hermas* narrates that he saw stones that were thrown away from the tower. Some of these stones "fell near the waters, but were unable to roll into the water, though they wanted to roll and go into the water".⁶ In *Vis.* 3,7,3 these stones are explained to be "those who heard the word and wanted to be baptized (βαπτισθῆναι) in the name of the Lord: (but) then, when the holiness of the truth comes into their mind, they change their mind (μετανοοῦσιν) and follow again their evil desires". Presumably, the stones represent neophytes or catechumens preparing for baptism.⁷ The focus is not on baptism, but on μετάνοια: the newcomers are as "stones" useless for the tower/church because they changed (μετανοοῦσιν) in the wrong direction.

In *Vis.* 3,3,5 the woman church explains to *Hermas* that the tower/church was built on water (*Vis.* 3,2,4), "because your [pl.] life was saved and will be saved through water". Baptism is the foundation of the church.⁸ The focus is again on μετάνοια. It is those who have already been baptized who are addressed: the "you" are the baptized. Moreover, it is stated in the same verse that "the tower was founded on the word of the Almighty and his honourable name". "The word" probably alludes to the preaching which led to conversion (see *Vis.* 3,7,3: οἱ τὸν λόγον ἀκούσαντες καὶ θέλοντες βαπτισθῆναι).⁹ Baptism signifies a believer's (initial) conversion.

Teaching on Baptism, p. 854: "In the *Shepherd*, the theme of baptism is overshadowed by the second metanoia".

5 GIET, *Hermas*, pp. 299–300, suggests that the bathing scene in *Vis.* 1,1 refers to Rhoda's baptism. But baptism is not explicitly mentioned and does not seem to be implied.

6 ἐτέρους... πλίπτοντας (*Vis.* 3,2,9; see also 3,7,3) indicates that these stones are those that were "thrown away" (ρίπτομένους) from the tower (*Vis.* 3,2,9). According to BLOMKVIST, *Teaching on Baptism*, p. 860, *Vis.* 3,2,9 refers to baptism.

7 See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 74.

8 See DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 440–441; OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 50; and BLOMKVIST, *Teaching on Baptism*, p. 859: "the water is evidently referred to as the baptismal water".

9 For neophytes, baptism and conversion are two sides of the same coin. For "neophytes", see also *Vis.* 3,5,4: "they are new in the faith, but believers" (νέοι εἰσὶν ἐν τῇ πίστει καὶ πιστοί).

In *Man.* 4,3,1 Hermas asks the Shepherd whether it is true that “there is no other μετάνοια except the one when we went down into the water and received forgiveness (ἄφεσιν) of our previous sins”. As already seen, the answer is that newcomers have forgiveness (ἄφεσις) of their previous sins (v. 3), but that those who believe already (“those who were called [κληθεῖσι] before these days”)¹⁰ have one (chance of) μετάνοια (v. 4). Again the focus is on μετάνοια. Baptized believers are referred to as “we” (κατέβημεν . . . ἐλάβομεν, v. 1); the others are referred to as “they” (v. 3): οἱ . . . νῦν πιστεύσαντες (presumably non-baptized believers) and (οἱ) μέλλοντες πιστεύειν (presumably people interested in the Christian faith). The issue is that there are baptized believers who sin. These sinners can restore their “baptismal blessedness . . . with conversion”,¹¹ but this does not imply that those who have not yet been baptized will after baptism always have a second chance.

In the *Similitudes* two phrases refer to baptism.¹² First there is “receiving the seal (σφραγίς)”.¹³ In *Sim.* 8,6,3 Hermas asks the Shepherd to explain to him the vision of the willow tree and its sticks, “so that, when they hear it,

10 κλήσις most likely refers to the initial conversion, confirmed by baptism. See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 115.

11 OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 104, argues that “you will live to God” (ζήσῃ τῷ θεῷ) in *Man.* 1,2 and elsewhere in *Hermas* is “a way of speaking of the continuation of baptismal blessedness restored with conversion”.

12 In *Sim.* 8 the watering of the sticks of the willow tree (8,2,7–8 and 8,3,8) is not a baptismal allusion, because the sticks represent people who are already believers and the water is just meant to revitalize (8,2,7–8), or purify the sticks (8,7,5). In *Sim.* 9,1,8 and 9,25,1–2 the “springs” (πηγαί) of the eighth mountain are no baptismal allusions either, because the ninth mountain “has no water at all” (ὅλως ὕδωρ οὐκ εἶχεν, *Sim.* 9,1,9), yet does represent (baptized) believers (9,26). In *Sim.* 9,10,3 the sprinkling of water is just meant to cleanse the (area of the) tower/church. In *Sim.* 9,13,5 the white colour of the garments of the believers may, according to OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 236, be a baptismal allusion, but this cannot be proven.

13 See also BAUER – ALAND, *Wörterbuch*, p. 1589: “Name für d. Taufe bei 2Kl und Hermas”; F.J. DÖLGER, *Sphragis. Eine altchristliche Taufbezeichnung in ihren Beziehungen zur profanen und religiösen Kultur des Altertums* (SGKA, 5), Paderborn, Schöningh, 1911, p. 70: “Das älteste unbestrittene Zeugnis für die Bezeichnung der Taufe als einer Sphragis begegnet in der ersten Hälfte des zweiten Jahrhunderts im Pastor des Hermas”; DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 591, 596; BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 357–369; LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, pp. 480 n. 201, 483 n. 239; OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 202, 206; BLOMKVIST, *Teaching on Baptism*, p. 865; and esp. K.O. SANDNES, *Seal and Baptism in Early Christianity*, in HELMHOLM – VEGGE – NORDERVAL – HELMHOLM (eds.), *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism*. II, pp. 1441–1481, esp. p. 1455, who argues that in *Hermas* the “seal” can refer to water (most likely the water of baptism), faith, repentance and proclamation (of the name of God’s Son).

those who have come to believe (οἱ πιστεύσαντες) and have received the seal (τὴν σφραγίδα), but have broken it and have not kept it undamaged . . . change (μετανοήσωσιν). The focus is on believers who sinned since baptism and need to change. *Sim.* 9,16 describes a two-stage process of conversion and baptism of (deceased) pre-Christian righteous by (deceased) Christian preachers (a version of the traditional motif of the *descensus ad inferos*).¹⁴ There are “stones” which ascend from the depth (the underworld) through water and are placed in the tower (vv. 1–2). Stones which lack “the seal” (μόνον δὲ τὴν σφραγίδα ταύτην οὐκ εἶχον, v. 7) are pre-Christian righteous; stones which have “the seal” (ἤδη ἐσχηκότες τὴν σφραγίδα, v. 5) are deceased apostles and teachers who preached the name of the Son of God to those who had fallen asleep and gave them “the seal (σφραγίδα) of the Son of God” (v. 3), or “the seal of preaching” (τὴν σφραγίδα τοῦ κηρύγματος, v. 5; cf. v. 4, κακέينوις . . . ἐκηρύχθη ἡ σφραγίς αὐτῇ) and “the seal” of baptism (“the seal . . . is the water”, ἡ σφραγίς . . . τὸ ὕδωρ ἐστίν, v. 4). Baptism is described as a ritual of going into and out of the water which symbolizes a change from deadliness into life (vv. 2, 4, 6–7). The focus is on the incorporation of the pre-Christian righteous into the church. Baptism plays a central role, but missionary overtones are out of the question. In *Sim.* 9,17 twelve multicolour mountains represent twelve tribes (φυλαί, v. 1) or people (ἔθνη, v. 2) which inhabit the world.¹⁵ “To these the Son of God was preached (ἐκηρύχθη) by the apostles” (v. 1). When the multicolour stones of the mountains are placed in the tower, the building gets one colour (v. 3), because “all the people (ἔθνη) that live under the heaven, having heard and believed, were called (ἐκλήθησαν) by the name of the Son of God. Having received the seal (σφραγίδα), they had one insight and one spirit and their faith and love became one . . . That is why the building of the tower became one colour” (v. 4). A worldwide mission, aiming at the conversion and baptism of all people, is envisioned. It is, however, difficult to decide whether the past tense (especially ἐκηρύχθη and ἐκλήθησαν) refers from a future perspective to the present (that is, Hermas’ times), or from a present perspective to the past (that is, before Hermas’ times). As a matter of fact, the vision involves the future church: the tower is not yet a monolith, but will eventually be like that. In other words, it remains uncertain whether Hermas saw the present or the past as a period of mission.¹⁶ In any case the

14 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 238.

15 The terminology may have Jewish overtones (φυλαί), but the perspective is universal (ἔθνη).

16 See also, e.g., *Sim.* 8,3,2. Historically it may be true and correct that already in this early period Christianity spread steadily. See, e.g., B. MOELLER, *Geschichte des Christentums in Grundzügen* (UTB, 905), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992⁵, pp. 35–42;

emphasis is on the unity of the church as “one body” (ἐν σῶμα, v. 5).¹⁷ Hermas’ focus is on the improvement of the church: the multicolour stones need to form a tower made of one stone. Concerning the described process of people hearing the preaching, coming to belief, being baptized and living a renewed life, it is the renewed life that matters most. Finally, in *Sim.* 9,31,1 stones which have not yet received the seal (*sigillum*) cannot be used for the tower. Most likely, the seal refers to baptism. Again, however, the focus is on μετάνοια: the “stones” are to be changed before they can enter God’s kingdom (v. 2) and it is the baptized which are addressed by the “angel of μετάνοια” (*nuntius poenitentiae* . . . *dico vobis qui hoc sigillum accepistis*, vv. 3–4): the baptized need to be “cured” while the tower is still being built (v. 1). The focus is on the improvement of the church by the change of its members.

A second phrase is “receiving the name”.¹⁸ In *Sim.* 9,16,3 “carrying the name of [the Son of] God” (φορέσαι . . . τὸ ὄνομα [τοῦ υἱοῦ] τοῦ θεοῦ)¹⁹ relates to “receiving the seal of God’s Son” (ἔλαβον . . . τὴν σφραγίδα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ . . . λάβῃ τὴν σφραγίδα). Baptism is meant, because in v. 4 it is stated that “the seal is the water”. The importance of the tower image as well as the emphasis on μετάνοια has already been discussed. In *Sim.* 9,12 it is stated that “the Son of God” (9,12,1) or “the name of the Son of God” (9,12,4)²⁰ is the only entrance into the tower/church (see also 9,13,1) and God’s kingdom (9,12,4–5) and the only access to the Lord (9,12,6). In the next pericope (9,13) it is stressed that baptism alone is in vain: only carrying the name is of no use (ἐὰν γὰρ τὸ ὄνομα μόνον λάβῃς, οὐδὲν

SOMMER – KLAHR, *Kirchengeschichtliches Repetitorium*, pp. 9–11; and R.L. MULLEN, *The Expansion of Christianity: A Gazetteer of Its First Three Centuries* (SVigChr, 69), Leiden, Brill, 2004, pp. 197–200 (on Rome). The question is, however, how contemporary people like Hermas perceived this development.

- 17 The unity (becoming ἐν σῶμα, ἐν πνεῦμα, etc., *Sim.* 9,13,5.7 and 9,17,3) is in *Hermas* not a baptismal allusion (pace OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 236), or Eucharistic allusion (with OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 244 n. 6), but a reference to the unity of the church. It is true that in Eph 4,4 ἐν σῶμα and ἐν πνεῦμα are mentioned in the context of baptism (ἐν βάπτισμα, v. 5), but cf. *Sim.* 9,17,5: “after they [i.e., the baptized] had come together and became one body . . .”.
- 18 See *Sim.* 9,12,4.8; 9,13,2–3.7; and 9,16,3. See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 234; and BLOMKVIST, *Teaching on Baptism*, who see this phrase as a reference to baptism.
- 19 τοῦ υἱοῦ is attested in L¹ L² and E, but not in A. It is accepted by WHITTAKER and LEUTZSCH, but not by EHRMAN. The reading of A is probably more original, because “of the Son” appears to be a further clarification.
- 20 C^a and E read τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ (WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN); L¹ and L² *fili dei*; C^s τοῦ υἱοῦ; and A τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ (JOLY). Most likely, the original reading was τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, which was later glorified (his *holy* name, A), or clarified (the name *of the Son*, C^s; *of his Son*, C^a E; *of the Son of God*, L¹ L²). On the basis of *Sim.* 9,12,1, it is reasonable to assume that the name of God’s Son is implied anyway.

ὠφελήσῃ, v. 2); one should also wear the garment of the virgins (vv. 2–5, 7), that is, live a virtuous life (9,15). Stones that carry the name, but not the garment are thrown away from the tower (9,13,3). The meaning of baptism is relativized. What matters is that one belongs to the tower (9,13,1.3–6.9), to God's servants (v. 7) and God's house (v. 9). All believers need to change, so that they form a perfectly harmonious community (vv. 5, 7).

On the basis of the baptismal allusions, we may conclude that Hermas' main interest is not the baptism of new members, but the change of present members of the church. All references to baptism are related to μετάνοια. Moreover, all baptismal allusions, except one, are related to the image of the tower, which represents the church in the ongoing process of change and improvement. The one exception is *Man.* 4,3,1, but there the focus is, again, on μετάνοια. Finally, the fact that there are only about a dozen allusions to baptism, yet dozens of references to μετάνοια (more than 150),²¹ is a further indication that Hermas' focus is not on the expansion, but on the improvement of the church. Hermas was well aware of the growth of the church. The church is portrayed as a huge progressive building project (esp. *Vis.* 3 and *Sim.* 9). Moreover, mission is envisioned among all the people of the world (esp. *Sim.* 9,17,1–4). For Hermas, however, the church is not so much to be extended (by proclaiming the gospel to outsiders) as to be consolidated (by improving the existing community). There may be two reasons for this. First, the author thinks that the end of times is near (*Sim.* 10,4,4). Second, it appears that the author believes that the church really needs to change, which makes him less a missionary than a preacher of μετάνοια. Baptism as initiation rite is, nevertheless, taken for granted and was in the author's circles presumably a well-established practice.

2 Metanoia

In the literature on *Hermas* the origin and meaning of μετάνοια has been one of the most debated themes. Some scholars take Hermas' views on μετάνοια as innovative²² and think that the author reacts to the "rigorist" idea of no

21 According to I. GOLDHAHN-MÜLLER, *Die Grenze der Gemeinde. Studien zum Problem der Zweiten Buße im Neuen Testament unter Berücksichtigung der Entwicklung im 2. Jh. bis Tertullian* (GTA, 39), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989, p. 245, μετάνοια (*Visions*, 7 times; *Mandates*, 15 times; *Similitudes*, 33 times), μετανοεῖν (*Vis.*, 15; *Man.*, 16; *Sim.*, 62) and *paenitentia* (*Sim.*, 8) occur 156 times in *Hermas*.

22 See, e.g., R. JOLY, *La doctrine pénitentielle du Pasteur d'Hermas et l'exégèse récente*, in *RHR* 147 (1955) 32–49; and SCHNEIDER, *Propter sanctam ecclesiam*, p. 73: *Hermas* "[kann] als

second chance.²³ Others believe that the idea of second repentance or penitence already existed before *Hermas*²⁴ and that the author is a rigorist himself who stresses that a baptized believer has *no more than one* other chance.²⁵ In *Hermas* μετάνοια has multiple aspects.²⁶ What follows will investigate these aspects in arbitrary order. For each aspect, only a few passages in *Hermas* will shortly be discussed.

(a) Acts of Penitence—It has been debated whether μετάνοια involves penitence. The two key passages are *Man.* 4,2,2 and *Sim.* 7,4. In the former, μετανοεῖ relates to humbling and torturing one's soul (ταπεινοῖ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν καὶ βασανίζει). In the latter, it is stated that "the one who changes needs to torture his soul and to humble himself severely in everything he does" (δεῖ τὸν

der erste ernste Versuch betrachtet werden . . . die Frage der postbaptismalen Sünden in ihrer Ganzheit und im Sinne der Kirche zu behandeln".

- 23 See, e.g., SCHNEIDER, *Propter sanctam ecclesiam*, pp. 73–74: *Hermas* "offenbart . . . nicht einen Kompromiß mit der Welt, sondern eher ein hohes Maß an pastoraler Sensibilität und christlichem Realismus"; and BLOMKVIST, *Teaching on Baptism*, p. 867: *Hermas* "opponents apparently esteemed baptism so highly that they could not accept any post-baptismal sin. The strongest possible argument, namely that of divine revelation was needed in order to propagate a less rigorous view on this subject". Cf. Hebr 6,4–6; 10,26; and 12,17 (see esp. H. LÖHR, *Umkehr und Sünde im Hebräerbrief* [BZNW, 73], Berlin, de Gruyter, 1994). It is suggested that *Hermas* polemicizes against the more rigorous teachings of Hebrews. See, e.g., GOLDHAHN-MÜLLER, *Grenze der Gemeinde*, p. 286: "*Hermas* [macht] die grundsätzlich akzeptierte rigorose Bußlehre des Hbr für die gegenwärtige Situation der nachapostolischen Gemeinden tragbar". It should be noted, however, that the idea in Hebrews that there is no other chance after baptism may not be too different from *Hermas*' views: both authors seem to use a similar pedagogical tool.
- 24 See, e.g., POSCHMANN, *Paenitentia secunda*, p. 203: *Hermas* "[setzt] eine bestehende Bußpraxis voraus . . . Was *Hermas* als neue Offenbarung predigt, ist nicht die grundsätzliche Bußmöglichkeit, sondern die Befristung der Buße, indem die Buße nur noch für die bis zu 'diesem Tag' begangenen Sünden gelten soll, nicht mehr dagegen für künftige Sünden".
- 25 *Ibid.*: "Es ist die Verkündigung nicht der ersten, sondern der letzten Bußmöglichkeit, womit er die sündige Christenheit unverzüglich zu einer Massenbekehrung aufrütteln will"; and BROX, *Hirt*, p. 479.
- 26 One of the best definitions of the term μετάνοια in *Hermas* (though with hardly any refs. to the text of *Herm.* itself) is that of J. PARAMELLE – P. ADNÈS, *Hermas*, in *DSp* 7 (1969) 316–334, p. 328: "La *metanoia*, que prêche le *Pasteur*, est un sentiment, une attitude, une activité complexe qui renferme en soi, avec le regret du passé et le ferme propos pour l'avenir, un changement d'âme, un renouvellement moral, une transformation de toute la vie. En un mot, c'est une vraie conversion". The phrase "un changement d'âme" is somewhat confusing, because it can mean "a change of soul", but also "a change of mind". Both a change of soul (or heart) and a change of mind are aspects of μετάνοια in *Hermas*. In the French definition this is not so clearly stated.

μετανοούντα βασανίσαι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν καὶ ταπεινοφρονῆσαι ἐν ἀπάσῃ τῇ πράξει αὐτοῦ ἰσχυρῶς). Μετάνοια is connected with humbling (ταπεινῶω) and torturing (βασανίζω) oneself.

Some have argued that μετάνοια involves institutionalized forms of penitence.²⁷ There is, however, no evidence for this. Even if in the image of the building of the tower, the removal and reintegration of stones implies some kind of exclusion and reacceptance of community members, it does not follow that μετάνοια involves institutional discipline. Other commentators think that penitential acts like fasting are implied.²⁸ An argument for this interpretation is found in *Vis.* 3,10,6, where humbling (ταπεινοφροσύνη) is associated with fasting (νηστεύειν). A small but not insignificant minority of commentators has argued, however, that μετάνοια refers not to penitence, but to changing one's inner attitude.²⁹ In *Man.* 4,2,3–4, where Hermas presents himself as a sinner (ἁμαρτωλὸς εἰμὶ) who in reaction to his sinfulness acknowledges that he needs to do things in order to live (ἵνα γνῶ ποῖα ἔργα ἐργαζόμενος ζήσομαι), penitential acts are not mentioned. Moreover, several parallels indicate that humbling (ταπεινῶω) and torturing (βασανίζω) one's ψύχη may well refer to one's inner self.³⁰ There is no evidence that μετάνοια would imply penitence.

27 See POSCHMANN, *Paenitentia secunda*, pp. 134–205, esp. pp. 189–202; GROTZ, *Entwicklung*, pp. 11–70, esp. pp. 64–70 (but cf. p. 64: “Dementsprechend durfte unter ‘Metanoia’ nicht einfach die kirchliche Buße verstanden werden” [italics mine]); and K. RAHNER, *The Penitential Teaching of the Shepherd of Hermas*, in *Theological Investigations* 15 (1982) 57–113, esp. p. 108 (“intervention by the Church in the penance of a sinner”).

28 See, e.g. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, esp. pp. 510–513 (“Christenbusse”); BAUER – ALAND, *Wörterbuch*, p. 1605 (“sich kasteien, fasten”); JOLY, *Hermas*, esp. pp. 22–30 (“la pénitence”); BROX, *Hirt*, p. 209 and esp. pp. 476–485 (“Buße”); LEUTZSCH, p. 448 n. 74 (“Brox 209f”, which seems to imply that Leutzsch agrees with Brox); SCHNEIDER, *Propter sanctam ecclesiam, passim* (Buße); and SOMMER – KLAHR, *Kirchengeschichtliches Repetitorium*, p. 14 (Buße). The position of OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 192, is somewhat ambivalent. On the one hand, she sees μετάνοια “not [as] a ritual or repetitive action, but a fundamental personal change” (p. 29). On the other hand, she comments on *Sim.* 7,4 that it refers to “doing penitence”, of which “one component is fasting” (p. 192).

29 See esp. W.C. VAN UNNIK, *Zur Bedeutung von ταπεινοῦν τὴν ψυχὴν bei den Apostolischen Vätern*, in *ZNW* 44 (1952–1953) 250–255; repr. in ID., *Sparsa Collecta. III. Patristica—Gnostica—Liturgica* (NT.S., 31), Leiden, Brill, 1983, pp. 71–76. Van Unnik only discusses the issue of ταπεινοῦν τὴν ψυχὴν (so, not βασανίζω). H.A. FREI, *Metanoia im ‘Hirten’ des Hermas*, in *IKZ* 65 (1975) 120–138, 176–204, p. 183, argues that μετάνοια in *Hermas* is “noch nicht bußtechnisch erstarrt” and that the German rendering “Buße” is anachronistic.

30 See, e.g., 2 Pet 2,8: Lot, ψυχὴν... ἐβασάνιζεν; and Diodorus Siculus 20,53,3 (ed. and trans. GEER): Ptolemy “[was] not at all humbled in spirit by his defeat” (οὐδὲν τῇ ψυχῇ ταπεινωθείς); and 20,77,3: Agathocles “was so cast down in spirit” (ἐταπεινώθη τὴν ψυχὴν).

(b) Social Aspect—It has been argued that a social element is involved: Hermas' call to μετάνοια would aim at the reintegration of the better-off into the community in order to support the needy.³¹ For Hermas, however, supporting the needy is not so much a social act (for other humans) as an act of piety (for God).³²

(c) Attitude—In *Man.* 5,1,7 μετάνοια (μετανοήσωσιν) involves doing away with “short temper” (ὀξύχολια). Μετάνοια is here a change of one's disposition.

(d) Mind—According to *Man.* 4,2,2, “μετάνοια is understanding (σύνεσις)” (ἢ μετάνοια σύνεσις ἐστίν; τὸ μετανοῆσαι σύνεσιν εἶναι; τὸ μετανοῆσαι . . . σύνεσις ἐστίν). The Shepherd, who is in charge of change (ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας), gives understanding (σύνεσιν) to all who change (πᾶσιν τοῖς μετανοοῦσιν). The sinner faces up to (συνίει) his sin before the Lord, changes (μετανοεῖ) and refrains from what is bad.³³ A change of mind is another aspect of μετάνοια in *Hermas*.³⁴

31 See LAMPE, *Die stadtrömischen Christen*, pp. 75–78, 348, esp. p. 75: “Hermas' Prophetie von der zweiten Busse hat die soziale Funktion, die Armenversorgung in der Gemeinde zu sichern. Oder anders: Die Prophetie der zweiten Busse zielt u.a. darauf, verweltlichte Reiche ins aktive Gemeindeleben zu reintegrieren, so dass wieder Geldmittel für die Armenpflege verfügbar werden”. Cf. BROX, *Hirt*, 485 n. 13: “die Reduktion des Hauptthemas Buße auf diese soziale Funktion ist falsch”, because the call to μετάνοια addresses not only the rich but all (contemporary) Christians and is not only related to social problems, but also, e.g., to (re)marriage and divorce (as in *Man.* 4). Brox has misunderstood Lampe's position: see Lampe's use of “u.a.”, that is, *among other things*.

32 See Chapter 6. See also DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 500; and JOLY, *Hermas*, p. 45. Pace BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 195–196; and OSIEK, *Shepherd, passim*; but cf. *Rich and Poor*, p. 133, where she refers to the “pious duty” of the rich toward the poor; and *Shepherd*, p. 261, where she notes that in *Sim.* 10,4,4 self-interest is a motive for doing well.

33 See further, e.g., *Vis.* 3,3,1—μετανοήσωσιν means that “they know (γινώσκωσιν) the Lord”; *Sim.* 9,22—about believers who are “people who know” (οἱ πιστεύσαντες . . . πιστοί . . . θέλοντες πάντα γινώσκειν καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλως γινώσκουσι, vv. 1–2): some of them changed (μετενόησαν), became true believers and submitted themselves to those who have insight (σύνεσις), because they realized their own ignorance (ἄφροσύνη, v. 3); *Sim.* 10,2,2—Hermas' message should make people who change (*qui egerint paenitentiam*) to think the same way as he does (*eadem sentiant quae et tu*); Hermas hopes that all will change (*agit paenitentiam*, v. 3). If the Greek underlying the Latin translations *egerint* and *agit paenitentiam* read a form of μετανοέω, the translations are incorrect, because, most likely, a change of mind (see *sentiant*) is meant.

34 Cf. MILLER, *Dreams*, p. 134, who interprets μετάνοια as a “change of consciousness”, that is, a change of one's (Hermas') understanding of the world and of oneself (p. 138), “a change from single to multiple understanding” (P. COX MILLER, “All the Words Were Frightful”: *Salvation by Dreams in the Shepherd of Hermas*, in *VigChr* 42 [1988] 327–338, p. 333). She takes the “angel of μετάνοια” as a “messenger of a change of mind” (p. 134) and regards *Hermas* as an “autobiographical therapy of consciousness” (p. 131). See also, e.g., ERNST,

(e) Soul and Heart—In *Vis.* 2,2,4 a change of soul (ψύχη) and heart (καρδιά) are interrelated: “sins will be forgiven” (ἀφίενται... ἁμαρτίαι) “when they change (μετανοήσουσιν) with all their heart (καρδιά) and do away with doubt (διψυχία) from their hearts (καρδίαι).”³⁵

(f) Sentiment and (g) Regret (of the Past)—In *Man.* 10,2,3–4 μετάνοια (μετανοεῖ) means that one “feels sad” (λυπεῖται) about what one has done wrong (πονηρὸν εἰργάσατο, v. 3). Μετάνοια involves here a sentiment, namely feelings of regret.³⁶

Hirt, passim, who interprets μετάνοια in *Hermas* as “Umdenken”. A change of mind is, however, just one aspect of μετάνοια in *Hermas*.

- 35 See further, e.g., *Man.* 9—“do away with διψυχία” (ἄρον... τὴν διψυχίαν, v. 1); “turn yourself (ἐπίστρεψον) with your whole heart (ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου) to the Lord” (v. 2); “clean your heart (καθαρίσον σου τὴν καρδίαν)” (v. 4); “clean (καθαρίσον) your heart (τὴν καρδίαν σου) from διψυχία” (v. 7), etc., so that every “request of the soul” (αἶτημα τῆς ψυχῆς, v. 2) will be fulfilled. For a recent study on the meaning of διψυχία in *Hermas*, see D.C. ROBINSON, *The Problem of Διψυχία in the Shepherd of Hermas*, in *StPatr* 45 (2010) 303–308, who argues that the term has a broader meaning than “doubt” (p. 306): “To be doubleminded is to lack faith”.

For a change of heart, see further, e.g., *Vis.* 1,3,2—“when they change with whole their heart” (ἐὰν μετανοήσουσιν ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας αὐτῶν); 3,13,4—“those who have changed (μετανοήσαντες) will be completely new... those who have changed with whole their heart (οἱ ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας μετανοήσαντες)”; 4,2,5 (μετανοήσητε ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸν κύριον); *Man.* 5,1,7 (ἂν μετανοήσωσιν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν); *Man.* 12—μετάνοια involves that one “has the Lord in one’s heart” (ἔχων τὸν κύριον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, 12,4,3; θέσθε... τὸν κύριον ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν καρδίαν, 12,4,5) and that people “change (μετανοοῦντων) with whole their heart (ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας αὐτῶν, 12,6,1, see also v. 5); *Sim.* 6,3,6—“when they change (ῥταν... μετανοήσωσιν), the evil deeds they have committed rise in their heart (ἀναβαίνει ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν) and they praise God that he is a righteous judge and that they have suffered righteously... From that moment on, they serve the Lord with their pure heart” (ἐν καθαρῷ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν, v. 6); *Sim.* 7,4 (μεταμενοήκασιν ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας αὐτῶν twice; note that ψυχή is mentioned in the same verse); and *Sim.* 9,33,3 (μετανοήσαντες ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας αὐτῶν).

For διψυχία in relation to μετάνοια, see further, e.g., *Sim.* 8,8,1—those who ἐδιψύχησαν “still have (a chance of) μετάνοιαν, when they change (μετανοήσωσιν) quickly” (v. 3); *Sim.* 8,8,4—deniers: “some of them ἐδιψύχησαν and were uncertain (ἐδιχοστάτησαν): for them there is still μετάνοια, when they change (μετανοήσωσιν) quickly” (v. 5); *Sim.* 8,9,1—those who ἐδιψύχησαν (being uncertain about their salvation) still have (a chance of) μετάνοια (v. 4); *Sim.* 8,10,1—for those who ἐδιψύχησαν there is still hope of change (ἐλπὶς μετανοίας, v. 2); and *Sim.* 9,21,1—διψυχοι: when they change (μετανοήσωσιν) quickly, they will live, but when they do not change (μὴ μετανοήσωσιν), their life will be taken (v. 4).

- 36 Another example may be *Man.* 4,1,7–8, which is about reunion of husband and wife in case of adultery. It is stated that if a Christian (v. 4) husband or wife (v. 8), who has

(h) Good Intentions (for the Future)—In *Man.* 4,2,2 μετάνοια (μετανοεῖ) means that “one does not anymore (οὐκέτι) do what is wrong, but what is right”.³⁷ It has been argued that it means the opportunity, given by God, to improve one’s future life.³⁸ There are at least two difficulties with this position. First, there is the idea of God’s gift. It is true that μετάνοια is a God-given opportunity. In *Sim.* 8,11,1 it is stated that the Lord in his mercy has sent the Shepherd to give (a chance of) μετάνοια to all, even though some are not worth to be saved because of their deeds. There is, however, an element of personal responsibility as well. In v. 3 it is noted that “all . . . who will change (μετανοήσωσιν) with whole their hearts, *purify themselves* of their previous bad deeds and do not add any more to their sins, will receive healing by the Lord of their previous sins” (v. 3).³⁹ Moreover, in *Sim.* 9,32,1 the Shepherd (the angel of μετάνοια, 9,31,3) exhorts the addressees: “*heal yourselves (remediate . . . vos)* while the tower is still being built”. Second, there is the orientation towards the future. In *Sim.* 6,2,4 “hope of change” (ἐλπίς . . . μετανοίας) relates to “hope of renewal” (ἐλπίδα . . . ἀνανεώσεως, v. 4). More generally, however, μετάνοια means both, to leave behind one’s former sinful life (orientation on the past) and to start a new life (orientation on the future).⁴⁰

(i) Moral Renewal—In *Sim.* 8,6,6 the change of sinners (ἡ μετάνοια τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν) means that those who “changed” (μετενοήσαν) “became good” (ἀγαθοὶ ἐγένοντο). Furthermore, in *Sim.* 9,14,1–2 μετάνοια means that believers (ἐάν . . . μετανοήσωσι) distance themselves from “vices” (9,15,3) and turn themselves to “virtues” (9,15,1–2).

committed adultery, repents (μετανοήσῃ), the partner is to take him or her back (vv. 7–8): “the one who has sinned but changes (μετανοοῦντα) is to be reaccepted, but not more than once: for God’s servants μετάνοιά ἐστιν μία”. μετάνοια may involve an expression of regret, because it seems to be implied that the partner asks whether the relationship can be restored (“if . . . one wishes . . . to return [to one’s partner], ἐάν . . . θελήσῃ . . . ὑποτρέψαι, v. 7).

37 See further, e.g., *Man.* 4,1,11 (μηκέτι ἀμαρτάνειν); 4,3,2 (μηκέτι ἀμαρτάνειν), 7 (μηκέτι προσθήσω ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις); and *Sim.* 6,1,4 (μηκέτι προστίθετε ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ὑμῶν).

38 See H.A. FREI, *Metanoia im ‘Hirten’ des Hermas*, in *IKZ* 64 (1974) 118–139, 189–201, pp. 190, 193–194 n. 40.

39 See *Sim.* 8,11,3: μετανοήσωσιν ἐξ . . . καὶ καθαρίσωσιν is attested in M L¹ L² E and C^s (and accepted by WHITTAKER; JOLY; and EHRMAN), but A reads: ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας αὐτῶν καθαρίσουσιν. The reading of A makes the sentence smoother and is therefore probably secondary.

40 See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 484, who argues against Frei: “Die μετάνοια ist im P[astor]H[ermae] völlig unbestritten beides, nämlich Nachlaß der seit der Taufe begangenen Sünden wie Neubeginn eines zum Besseren veränderten künftigen Lebens”.

(j) Transformation—In *Vis.* 3,13,4 it is stated that οἱ μετανοήσαντες “will be completely new” (ὁλοτελῶς νέοι ἔσονται). And in *Sim.* 9,14,3 Hermas thanks the Lord that “he has sent the angel of μετάνοια to us who have sinned against him, has renewed our spirit (ἀνεκαίνισεν ἡμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα) . . . and renewed our life (ἀνενέωσε τὴν ζωὴν ἡμῶν).⁴¹

(k) Action—In *Sim.* 9,20,4 μετάνοια means to make up for (ἀναδράμωσιν) what one failed to do (οὐκ εἰργάσαντο) earlier and to do something good (ἀγαθὸν τι ποιήσωσιν, twice). It is contrasted with staying in one’s practices (ἐπιμείνωσιν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτῶν). Μετάνοια means here a change of conduct.⁴²

We may conclude that μετάνοια in *Hermas* means a believer’s personal transformation: it is a change of attitude, behaviour, feeling, heart, soul and mind,

41 See further, e.g., *Sim.* 8,6,1—those “who have changed (μετενόησαν)” are the sticks of the willow tree that revived (v. 1). (A willow tree is vital [φιλόζωόν, v. 1], that is, sticks that are cut off and planted can revive—this biological fact is elaborated in *Sim.* 8,2,7). In v. 3 Hermas asks the Shepherd to explain him the meaning of the vision of the willow tree and the sticks, so that baptized believers who have sinned realize what they have done and will change (μετανοήσωσιν). The Shepherd’s task is “to renew their spirits” (τοῦ ἀνακαίνισαι τὰ πνεύματα αὐτῶν, v. 3). Furthermore, in *Sim.* 9,11,5–9 the rejuvenation of Hermas corresponds to his change. See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 229: “His [Hermas] rejuvenation, an image of conversion, mirrors that of the woman church in the third *Vision* [*Vis.* 3,11–13], which was also the result of the conversion of members of the church”.

42 See further, e.g., *Vis.* 2,2,3–4—μετάνοια (μετανοήσουσιν, v. 4) includes that Hermas’ wife, who “does not hold her tongue” (αὕτη οὐκ ἀπέχεται τῆς γλώσσης), “will hold (it)” (ἀφέξεται) (v. 3); *Man.* 12,6,2—μετάνοια means doing justice (ἐργάσηθε τὴν δικαιοσύνην, 12,6,2); *Sim.* 8,8,5—μετανοήσωσιν is contrasted with “but when they stay in their practices” (ἐὰν δὲ ἐπιμείνωσιν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτῶν); and *Sim.* 9,26,2—μετάνοια means (for deacons) to change (ἐπιστρέψωσι) and to bring (their) service to a good end (ἀγνώως τελειώσωσι τὴν διακονίαν αὐτῶν).

For μετάνοια as change of behaviour in relation to the (twelve) commandments, see, e.g., *Vis.* 5,7—μὴ μετανοήσητε is contrasted with bringing into practice (ἐργάσηθε αὐτάς) the commandments (and parables); and *Man.* 4,2,3—Hermas presents himself as a sinner (ἁμαρτωλὸς εἰμί) who acknowledges that he is “to do things” in order to live (ἵνα γνῶ ποῖα ἔργα ἐργαζόμενος ζήσομαι), which is in v. 4 further elaborated as keeping (φυλάξῃς) and going forth in (πορευθῇς) the commandments.

A. CARLINI, *Μετανοεῖν ε μεταμέλῃσθαι nelle visioni di Erma*, in S. JANERAS (ed.), *Miscellanea papirologica Ramón Roca-Puig*, Barcelona, Fundació Salvador Vives Casajuan, 1987, pp. 97–102, argues that μετάνοια means concrete action. But this is just one aspect. Moreover, in some instances concrete action is not involved. For instance, in *Sim.* 8,6,6, where those who “have changed” (μετενόησαν) are said to “have become good” (ἀγαθοὶ ἐγένοντο), no concrete action is described. See further, e.g., *Sim.* 6,1,4—οἱ . . . μετανοοῦντες “put on every virtue of righteousness”; and *Sim.* 8,10,3—μετάνοια (μετενόησαν) means “doing every virtue of righteousness” (ἐργάζονται πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν δικαιοσύνης).

aiming at moral renewal by regretting one's old self and starting a new life. A social (communal) or ritual (penitential) aspect is not involved. Changing one's life by means of μετάνοια does not involve any ritual.

Concluding Remarks

Baptizing new believers as sign of their (initial) conversion is in *Hermas* assumed to be a common practice. *Hermas*' focus is, however, not on baptizing outsiders (expansion of the church), but on changing the present community (improvement of the existing church). For this change, the term μετάνοια is used, which refers to a baptized believer's personal change: it is a change of attitude, behaviour, feeling, heart, soul and mind, aiming at moral renewal by regretting one's old self and starting a new life. A social (communal) or ritual (penitential) aspect is not involved. For *Hermas*, the ideal church is a perfectly harmonious community, consisting of renewed believers (esp. *Sim.* 9,17,5), but the contemporary church a *corpus mixtum* full of sinful members (esp. *Vis.* 3 and *Sim.* 9).

Community Meals

Hermas does not explicitly mention the Eucharist.¹ It will be argued, however, that *Vis.* 3,9 and *Sim.* 9,11 hint at Eucharistic meals as real, satisfying community suppers.

1 *Vision 3,9*

In *Vis.* 3,9,1 the woman church complains that her children (τέκνα, vv. 1, 9) do not cease doing evil. She criticizes them for “unmixing” (ἀσυγκρασία, v. 4).² The context makes clear that what is meant is a lack of sharing: “This unmixing, then, is harmful for you who have but do not give to the needy”.³ A lack of sharing among fellow-believers seems to be involved, because the woman church addresses her “children” on how they should treat “each other” (v. 2).

It has been assumed that the social critique is in vv. 1–6 addressed to all believers (all “children” of the woman church) and in vv. 7–10 narrowed down to church leaders.⁴ But this does not seem to be the case. Addressed are only the haves (vv. 1–6); the have-nots are merely referred to in the third person (vv. 2,4–6). Furthermore, there are several indications that the perspective does not shift from one group (haves) to another (church leaders), but that the latter is meant to be a subgroup of the former. Both are called “children” (τέκνα, vv. 1, 9). Further, v. 7 opens with “so now I say to you” (νῦν οὖν ὑμῖν λέγω), which shows continuity with the “you” (pl.) of the previous verses. Finally, the exhortation in v. 2, to “have peace among one another” (εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς), is repeated in v. 10 (εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς). The phrase may well refer back to *Vis.* 3,5,1, where church leaders of the past and present were praised for the fact that, among other things, they “were in peace with each other” (ἐν ἑαυτοῖς εἰρήνην ἔσχον). It seems, therefore, that one group of “well-situated” believers

1 See BROX, *Hirt*, p. 527.

2 According to the online *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (accessed 18 March 2015), the noun is a *hapax legomenon*.

3 See *Vis.* 3,9,4: αὕτη οὖν ἡ ἀσυγκρασία βλαβερὰ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἔχουσι καὶ μὴ μεταδιδοῦσιν τοῖς ὑστερουμένοις.

4 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 81–82.

is addressed: first the group as a whole (vv. 1–6) and then a subgroup of those in leading positions (vv. 7–10).⁵

In both parts of *Vis.* 3,9 the critique comes to a similar point: antisocial behaviour. In vv. 1–6 the group at large is reprimanded for “unmixing”, which is most likely related to the recurring critique in *Hermas* on Christian “haves” who are unwilling to associate with the “have-nots”.⁶ Ἀσυγκρασία could therefore be rendered “a lack of communal spirit”.⁷ It relates here to sharing food: in v. 3 “those who have (too) much food” (οἱ μὲν . . . ἀπὸ τῶν πολλῶν ἐδεσμάτων) are contrasted with “those who have no food” (τῶν δὲ μὴ ἐχόντων ἐδέσματα) and “do not have enough to eat” (μὴ ἔχειν τὸ ἀρκετὸν τῆς τροφῆς); and in v. 5 the haves are called to “seek out the hungry” (ἐκζητεῖτε τοὺς πεινῶντας).

From this perspective, the problematic verse 2 is to be interpreted. Here the woman church says to the haves: μὴ μόνοι τὰ κτίσματα τοῦ θεοῦ μεταλαμβάνετε ἐκ καταχύματος, ἀλλὰ μεταδίδοτε καὶ τοῖς ὑστερουμένοις. There are two major problems, as the following translations indicate. Dibelius translates: “verbraucht nicht für euch allein, was Gott geschaffen hat, sondern spendet von eurem Ueberfluß (?) auch den Bedürftigen”.⁸ Brox renders: “Beansprucht nicht für euch allein, was Gott geschaffen hat, sondern gibt den Notleidenden vom Überfluß mit”.⁹ Osiek takes it to mean: “do not only help yourselves to the best of God’s creatures, but share them with the needy”.¹⁰

A first problem is the meaning of ἐκ καταχύματος. Dibelius’ as well as Brox’ translation (“from abundance”) is based on the suggestion that it would mean *ex abundantia*.¹¹ Osiek’s translation (“to the best”) is a free rendering, influenced by the idea that μεταλαμβάνω ἐκ καταχύματος would be a proverbial

5 Cf. WANSINK, *Autobiographical Insights*, p. 80, who argues that *Vis.* 3,9,1–6 and 7–10 are both dealing with church officials: “The officers of the church, many of whom are wealthy, have acted in inappropriate ways”.

6 See esp. *Vis.* 3,6,2; *Sim.* 8,8,1, 8,9,1; 9,20,2; and 9,26,3. See OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, pp. 123–125; and EAD., *Shepherd*, pp. 72, 81, 208–209, 246, 249.

7 See also BAUER – ALAND, *Wörterbuch*, p. 237: “[d]ie] Mangel an Zusammenhalten oder Gemeingeist”. Cf. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 80: “lack of mixing”; and p. 81: “lack of sharing”.

8 See DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 475 (italics mine).

9 See BROX, *Hirt*, p. 148 (italics mine).

10 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 80 (italics mine).

11 See GEBHARDT – HARNACK, *Hermas Pastor*, p. 51, who do not provide any exemplifying parallels. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 149, wrongly states: “Dibelius seinerseits übersetzt den . . . Text nach Preuschen, Handwörterbuch, wie folgt: ‘aus der Brühe fischen’ = ‘für sich ergattern’”. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 475, mentions this meaning, but continues: “Wahrscheinlicher ist mir, daß κατάχυμα hier in der . . . Bedeutung ‘Überfluß’ steht”.

expression meaning “to grab everything for oneself”.¹² All three have been guided by Preuschen’s/Bauer’s translation “to take from the broth” (“aus der Brühe fischen”).¹³ Μεταλαμβάνω ἐκ καταχύματος means something like “to take from what has been poured out”. Its exact figurative meaning remains so far uncertain. It is clear, however, that what is meant is a lack of sharing of food among the haves and have-nots.

A second problem involves the position of ἀλλά in the sentence. The issue is whether it should be read before or after ἐκ καταχύματος. S Bo A and L² read μεταλαμβάνετε ἐκ καταχύματος, ἀλλά μεταδίδοτε.¹⁴ But L¹ translates *et nolite soli creaturas dei percipere. Abundantius etiam impertite egentibus*, which made Dibelius suggest that the original text read μεταλαμβάνετε, ἀλλά ἐκ καταχύματος μεταδίδοτε.¹⁵ In the first case, ἐκ καταχύματος refers to what the haves take for themselves and are unwilling to share with the have-nots (as in Osiek’s translation). In the second case, to what the haves are to share with the have-nots (as in Dibelius’ and Brox’ translations). All Greek witnesses (S Bo and A) as well as L² read ἀλλά after ἐκ καταχύματος. Furthermore, L¹ is the *lectio facilior*, because it reads one object with each verb rather than both objects with the verb in the first clause, and therefore probably secondary. For these reasons, Dibelius’ widely accepted emendation should best be abandoned.

So Vis. 3,9,2 reads: “do not only (for yourselves) take the things which God created from what is poured out, but give also to the needy”. Apparently, the haves are criticized for not sharing their provisions with the have-nots.

In vv. 7–10 the subgroup of οἱ προηγούμενοι τῆς ἐκκλησίας and οἱ πρωτοκαθεδρίται¹⁶ is reprimanded for not correcting this antisocial behaviour.

12 See BAUER – ALAND, *Wörterbuch*, p. 856; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 80.

13 See BAUER – ALAND, *Wörterbuch*, p. 856.

14 This reading is accepted by WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN. E does not read ἐκ καταχύματος, ἀλλά. This reading is clearly secondary, because it is more likely that the translator omitted the highly problematic phrase than that others would have added it.

15 See DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 475. Dibelius’ emendation is widely accepted. See, e.g., JOLY, *Hermas*, p. 122; and BROX, *Hirt*, p. 149 (with further refs.).

16 τῆς ἐκκλησίας is attested in S (Bo) A L² and E (accepted by WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN). L¹ reads a plural, which seems to be secondary, because the singular is better attested. πρωτοκαθεδρίταις is attested in S^c (Bo) A L¹ (L²) (accepted by WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN). S reads πρωτοκαθεδριεις and E πρεσβυτέροις. S appears to have made a mistake in writing and is, therefore, probably secondary. E is the *lectio facilior*: it is more likely that the more unusual term πρωτοκαθεδρίταις was changed into the more common “presbyters” than vice versa.

The first expression, “they who precede the church”,¹⁷ refers back to *Vis.* 2,2,6 (οἱ προηγούμενοι τῆς ἐκκλησίας).¹⁸ They are probably the same people as “the presbyters who preside the church” in *Vis.* 2,4,3.¹⁹

It has been suggested that the πρωτοκαθεδρίται are the same as the προηγούμενοι,²⁰ or that the former is a sarcastic term for those who desire to have honourable positions or who take pride in their social status.²¹ In *Hermas* πρωτοκαθεδρίτης occurs only once (*h.l.*). Similar expressions are used in *Vis.* 3,1,8 and *Man.* 11,12, but in different ways. In *Vis.* 3,1,8 Hermas requests the woman church to let the πρεσβύτεροι “sit first”.²² It has been debated whether this implies that elderly people may sit first, or that it emphasizes presbyteral authority.²³ In *Man.* 11,12 it is stated that a false prophet “wants to have the first seat”.²⁴ The two examples are not very helpful, because they leave open whether οἱ πρωτοκαθεδρίται means “they who take the first seats” (cf. *Vis.* 3,1,8), or “they who want to have the first seats” (cf. *Man.* 11,12).

In the New Testament πρωτοκαθεδρίτης is unattested, but the related term πρωτοκαθεδρία occurs in the Synoptics. In these gospels πρωτοκαθεδρία is used only with a negative connotation, namely in relation to the Pharisees and scribes who want to have an honoured place in the synagogue.²⁵ Interestingly, in three of these texts the desire to have the first seat in the synagogue is related to the desire to have “the first seats at meals”.²⁶ It is striking that L¹ translates οἱ πρωτοκαθεδρίται in *Vis.* 3,9,7 with “you . . . who love to sit first” (*qui . . . amatis primos consessus*), a translation which may well have been influenced by the gospel texts.²⁷ Without assuming any literary dependence, there is perhaps

17 An apt translation of ὁ προηγούμενος is the Dutch word “voorganger”, which is a common term for a church minister and preserves the meaning of the Greek (“the one who goes before/precedes”).

18 προηγέομαι κτλ. occurs in *Hermas* only in *Vis.* 2,2,6 and 3,9,7.

19 See also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 81 n. 13. See *Vis.* 2,4,3: μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τῶν προϊσταμένων τῆς ἐκκλησίας.

20 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 81. See also p. 55, where she interprets the πρωτοκαθεδρίται as “those who hold the first place”, being a title for church leaders.

21 This interpretation is raised but rejected by FUNK, *Hermas Pastor*, pp. 371–372.

22 See *Vis.* 3,1,8: ἄφες τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους πρῶτον καθίσαι.

23 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 62–63 (with refs.).

24 See *Man.* 11,12: θέλει πρωτοκαθεδρίαν ἔχειν.

25 See Matt 23,6; Mark 12,39; Luke 11,43; and 20,46.

26 See Mark 12,39; Luke 20,46 (πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ πρωτοκλισίας ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις); and Matt 23,6 (φιλοῦσιν δὲ τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις καὶ τὰς πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς).

27 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 81.

something to be said for the idea that, in light of the three gospel texts (and *Man.* 11,12), πρωτοκαθεδρίται in *Vis.* 3,9,7 means “you who desire to have the best places (at meals).”²⁸ If this interpretation is correct, there is an agreement with the social critique in vv. 1–6. In the three gospel texts, the meals are communal δείπνα. Maybe Hermas’ critique aims at the δείπνα of the Christian community.

What the church leaders and “snobs” (among them?) are reprimanded for, is their lack of mutual correction: “How do you want to discipline the Lord’s elect, while you do not have discipline yourselves? So discipline each other” (vv. 10–11).²⁹ They are compared to “poisoners” (φαρμακοί) who, instead of carrying their poison in boxes, carry their poison in their hearts (v. 7). It has been suggested that the poison refers to false teachings,³⁰ but others have convincingly argued that it refers to a lack of social conscience.³¹ V. 9 speaks of “divisions” (διχοστασίαι) among them and v. 10 admonishes them to “have peace among each other”. Ongoing antisocial behaviour among community members is the problem.

Overeating and drinking and a lack of sharing are recurring themes in *Hermas*.³² *Vis.* 3,9 seems to focus more specifically on the Christian community meals. Apart from the use of πρωτοκαθεδρίται, which connotes the desire to have the best seat at a δείπνον, there is another even stronger indication. *Vis.* 3,9 shows some important similarities with Paul’s critique on the celebration of the Lord’s Supper in 1 Cor 11,17–34.³³ It does not follow that Hermas

28 W.L. LANE, *Social Perspectives on Roman Christianity during the Formative Years from Nero to Nerva: Romans, Hebrews, 1 Clement*, in DONFRIED – RICHARDSON (eds.), *Judaism and Christianity*, pp. 196–244, p. 242, comments on *Vis.* 3,9,7 that for the celebration of the Eucharist there was a seating arrangement which distinguished “ordinary worshippers” from “officially recognized leaders”; and on *Sim.* 8,7,4 that the use of πρωτεύς “suggests that the presbyter-bishop who celebrated the Eucharist enjoyed a higher status than the other presbyters and deacons gathered around him”. For the idea of a seating arrangement, see also MAIER, *Social Setting*, pp. 130, 140–142 n. 113; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 81 n. 14 (with refs.).

29 See *Vis.* 3,9,10–11: πῶς ὑμεῖς παιδεύειν θέλετε τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς κυρίου, αὐτοὶ μὴ ἔχοντες παιδείαν; παιδεύετε ὅν ἄλλήλους.

30 See SNYDER, *Shepherd*, pp. 51–52.

31 See OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 81–82.

32 For the theme of eating and drinking too much, see esp. *Man.* 6,2,5, which criticizes an overabundance of food and drink as well as revelries; *Man.* 6,8,3, a catalogue of vices that lists drunkenness and overeating; and *Man.* 12,2,1, a critique on overeating and too much drinking. For sharing in the context of a (private) supper (δείπνον), see esp. *Sim.* 5,2,9–11.

33 W. SCHRAGE, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. III. 1Kor 11,17–14,40 (EKK, 7), Zürich – Düsseldorf, Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1999, pp. 5–107, does not mention any similarities between 1 Cor and *Hermas*.

knew Paul's writing, but that the two passages seem to be about the same issue, namely the meals of the Christian community.

There are at least six similarities. First, both Paul and Hermas are concerned with a lack of communal spirit. Paul speaks of *σχίσματα* (v. 18) and *αἰρέσεις* (v. 19) in the community. Hermas mentions a situation of *ἀσυγκρασία* (v. 4) and *διχοστασίαι* (v. 9). Moreover, in *Hermas* a lack of mutual peace (vv. 2, 10) relates to dissensions.³⁴

Second, the “haves” are criticized for not sharing with the “have-nots”. Paul mentions only the have-nots (*μὴ ἔχοντες*, v. 22); Hermas both the haves (*οἱ ἔχοντες*, v. 4; *οἱ ὑπερέχοντες*, v. 5) and the have-nots (*μὴ ἔχοντες ἐδέσματα*, v. 3). Moreover, the failure of the haves to share with the have-nots is described in a similar way. Paul blames the Corinthians for taking (*προλαμβάνει*, v. 21) their own meal (rather than dividing it in equal portions among the participants). Hermas reprimands the haves for taking (*μεταλαμβάνετε*, v. 2) food for themselves (rather than sharing it with the needy).

Third there is the theme of illness (*ἀσθένεια*). Paul states that many Corinthians are sick (*ἀσθενεῖς*) and weak and several have died (v. 30), because they partake of the Lord's Supper in an unworthy manner (v. 27). Hermas contends that those who eat too much get a disease (*ἀσθενεῖαν*) and that those who have not enough food damage their body in another way (v. 3).³⁵ In both cases, illness is the result of—so to speak—wrong “table manners”.

34 See esp. *Man.* 2,3, where “never peaceful” (*μηδέποτε εἰρηνεύων*) relates to “always in dissensions” (*πάντοτε ἐν διχοστασίαις*); and *Sim.* 8,7,2, where sticks “with cracks” (*ἐν αὐταῖς σχισμάς*) are said to be “never in peace” (*μηδέποτε εἰρηνεύοντες*), but “always in dissensions” (*διχοστατοῦντες πάντοτε*).

35 It has been argued that this is a combination of two traditions. First, a (primarily) Stoic concern about physical problems caused by overeating. Second, a (primarily) Jewish and Christian concern about damage caused by under-nourishment. See esp. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 81: “Two traditions cross in these verses. The concern about damage caused to the body by unhealthy overindulgence is primarily Stoic; the concern about the damage done by deprivation, though it also appears in Stoic reflection from the perspective of the responsibility of those well-off, is primarily Jewish and Christian”. See also, e.g., DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 475. But the perspective in *Vis.* 3,9 is, in fact, that of the responsibility of the well-off. See esp. v. 3, where it is stated that the “unmixing” is harmful *for the haves* who do not share with the have-nots. See further Chapter 6. The two concerns in *Hermas* about overeating and under-nourishment are both found in Stoicism (without the need to assume any literary dependence). For the former, see, e.g., Musonius 18A (ed. HENSE), who writes that cookery books “ruin one's health” (*τὴν δ' ὑγίειαν διαφθείρει*) and that one can see that people who eat and drink too much are in a poorer condition. For the latter, e.g., Seneca, *Ep.* 14,3 (ed. GUMMERE), who links “want” (*inopia*) with “illness” (*morbus*)

Fourth, the illness of the community members is connected with (God's) judgement. Paul speaks of God's judgement in the present: those who partake of the Lord's Supper in an unworthy manner come under God's judgement (κρίμα, vv. 29, 34; [κατα]κρίνομαι, vv. 31–32). Hermas refers to the coming judgement from an eschatological perspective: the haves should bear the coming judgement (κρίσις) in mind and seek out the hungry while the tower is not yet finished, for when the building is ready, they will have no more chance to do well (v. 5).³⁶

Fifth, there is the theme of “chastisement” (παιδεία). Paul writes in relation to the Lord's Supper that “we are judged and chastised (παιδεύομεθα) by the Lord, lest we are condemned with the world” (v. 32). Hermas asks the church leaders how they think they can chastise (παιδεύειν) other believers when they have no chastisement (παιδείαν) themselves and exhorts them to chastise (παιδεύετε) one another (v. 10).

Finally, both authors use the same unusual combination of μὴ ἔχοντες and a form of πεινᾶω. Paul combines ὃς πεινᾷ (v. 21, cf. v. 34) with μὴ ἔχοντας (v. 22); Hermas μὴ ἔχοντες ἐδέσματα (v. 3) with οἱ πεινῶντες (v. 5). In (the Septuagint and) the New Testament the combination of μὴ ἔχοντες and πεινᾶω in the same context is found only in 1 Cor 11,21–22. In *Hermas* μὴ ἔχοντες (in the sense of “have-nots”) and (a form of) πεινᾶω is used only in *Vis.* 3,9,5.³⁷

These similarities indicate that Paul and Hermas are dealing with a similar topic. Maybe the critique of both authors relates to the Christian community meals. All in all, the preceding analysis of *Vis.* 3,9 tentatively suggests that the author Hermas was familiar with Christian community meals in the sense of real, satisfying δεῖπνα.

2 *Similitude* 9,11

In Chapter Ten and Eleven it will be argued that the meeting of Hermas and the virgins in *Sim.* 9,11 alludes to the Christian assembly. If this is indeed true, the δεῖπνον referred to in v. 8 might be a Christian community meal. At the end of the meeting, the Shepherd asks Hermas: “what... have you eaten

as “natural evils” (*naturalia mala*); and 14,15 (ed. GUMMERE), where Seneca states that temperance effectuates a good health (*et tamen facit temperantia bonam valetudinem*).

36 Hermas uses κρίσις only in *Vis.* 3,9,5 (κρίμα is not used at all). For κατακρίνω, cf. *Sim.* 8,11,3 (κ. ἐαυτούς).

37 In *Hermas* a more common word for the needy is ὑστερούμενοι. See *Vis.* 3,9,2.4.6; *Man.* 2,4; 8,10; *Sim.* 5,3,7; and 9,27,2.

(ἐδεῖπνηςας)?”, to which Hermas replies, “I have eaten (ἐδεῖπνησα) . . . the words of the Lord all night” (v. 8). Apparently, the Shepherd takes it for granted that a supper (δεῖπνον) was part of the meeting. Perhaps this δεῖπνον hints at the Lord’s Supper.

3 The Lord’s Supper as a Real (Filling) Meal

The question that presents itself is whether in Hermas’ time Christians gathered together for a real meal. The following survey will show that this question is to be answered affirmatively.³⁸

Paul designates the communal meal in Corinth as δεῖπνον, that is, a supper, the main meal at the end of the day.³⁹ Paul’s critique on the Corinthian way of celebrating this meal shows that it was meant to have a social function: the food, brought in by the community members, had to be divided in equal portions among the participants. Because of its charitable function, the communal meal is in early Christian writings also called ἀγάπη.⁴⁰

In the *Didache* the Eucharist is portrayed also as a real meal. *Didache* 9–10 give instructions for the celebration of the Eucharist: chapter 9 explains how to say grace over the cup and the bread before the meal and chapter 10 describes the concluding benediction after the meal. It is implied that between these two chapters the Eucharistic meal takes place. *Didache* 10 opens with the remark, “when you are *satisfied*, say grace in the following way”,⁴¹ which indicates that the Eucharist was a real meal.

Pliny the Younger, Roman governor of Bithynia-Pontus in Asia Minor (ca. 110–112 CE), writes in a letter to Trajan that the Christians in his area gather regularly on a fixed day (probably on Sunday, after work) “to have a meal of an ordinary, harmless kind”.⁴² According to Pliny’s information, the Christian meals were real dinners.

38 The short survey is largely based on what I learned from the classes of Professor Henk Jan de Jonge at Leiden University. See further H.J. DE JONGE, *The Early History of the Lord’s Supper*, in J.W. VAN HENTEN – A. HOUTEPEN (eds.), *Religious Identity and the Invention of Tradition* (STAR, 3), Assen, Van Gorcum, 2001, pp. 209–237; and ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, esp. pp. 79–146. De Jonge and Alikin do not interpret the meals in *Hermas* in terms of the Lord’s Supper.

39 See 1 Cor 11,20.

40 See, e.g., Jude 12; Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 7,1 (ed. EHRMAN; εὐχαριστίας . . . ἀγαπᾶν); and 8,2.

41 See *Did.* 10,1 (ed. EHRMAN): μετὰ δὲ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι οὕτως εὐχαριστήσατε.

42 See Pliny, *Ep.* 10,96 (ed. RADICE): *ad capiendum cibum, promiscuum tamen et innoxium*. A.N. SHERWIN-WHITE, *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary*, Oxford,

Justin Martyr (Rome, *ca.* 150 CE) refers to the Sunday Eucharist in terms of the distribution of a substantial meal among all members of the community, not only those present, but also those absent.⁴³ The meal is brought in by the better-off as well as the less-fortunate⁴⁴ and consists of bread, wine and water over which prayers of thanksgiving are said.⁴⁵ The distributed food was meant to support community members in needy circumstances, like orphans, widows, the sick, prisoners and travellers.⁴⁶ Again, the Eucharist is a real meal.

At the end of the second century, Tertullian (Carthage, 197 CE) still speaks of a real meal. He designates it as *triclinium Christianorum, cena (nostra), ἀγάπη* and *convivium*.⁴⁷ He writes that “one eats just as much as is necessary to satisfy one’s hunger; one drinks as much as is useful for modest people . . . this is how they [Christians] satisfy themselves”.⁴⁸ He stresses its charitable function by stating that it supports the needy.⁴⁹

For Paul, the *Didache*, Pliny, Justin and Tertullian, the Christian community meal was a real supper. Most likely, the community meals held by Christians in the first and second century were real meals.⁵⁰ It is not until the third century that a distinction between a Eucharistic, symbolic meal (on Sunday morning) and a real supper (on Sunday evening) becomes visible. This development is not the result of the separation of Eucharist and ἀγάπη. Originally, there was only one type of meal (Eucharist/ἀγάπη), held on Sunday afternoon (after work). Apart from this supper, Christians began to celebrate services of prayer and worship on Sunday morning (before work). In the course of time,

Clarendon, 1966, p. 707, argues that the information was meant “to show that this was a meal similar, by the official standard, to those associated with the hitherto legal clubs and guilds”. J.C. SALZMANN, *Pliny (ep. 10,96) and Christian Liturgy—A Reconsideration*, in *StPatr* 20 (1989) 389–395, p. 395, comments that Pliny was “convinced that the Christians’ customs were harmless in terms of criminal law” (but “thought, nonetheless, that Christians should be punished”, p. 389 n. 1).

43 See Justin, *1 Apol.* 67,3 (ed. MINNS – PARVIS; τῇ τοῦ ἡλίου λεγομένη ἡμέρᾳ), 5 (διάδοσις).

44 *Ibid.*, v. 6.

45 *Ibid.*, v. 5.

46 *Ibid.*, v. 7.

47 See, resp. Tertullian, *Apol.* 39,15 (ed. BECKER); 16 and 19; 16 (“our meal . . . is called love [i.e., ἀγάπη] among the Greeks”, *cena nostra . . . id vocatur quod dilectio penes Graecos*); and 17–18.

48 *Ibid.*, v. 17, *editur quantum esurientes capiunt; bibitur quantum pudicis utile est*; 18, *ita saturantur*.

49 *Ibid.*, v. 16: *inopes . . . iuvamus*.

50 See ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, pp. 80–81: “In the first and second centuries . . . the weekly communal supper of Christian communities, that is, the Eucharist, and the *agape* meal were one and the same event, taking place in the evening”.

the meal (Eucharist/ἁγίαση) was introduced into these morning services.⁵¹ Ps. Hippolytus of Rome writes around the year 250 that the Sunday communion is administered to the whole community (*omni populo*), whereas the community supper (*cena*) is attended only by some community members (*qui adsunt fideles*).⁵² Unlike the former, the latter is “a benediction and no Eucharist, symbol of the body of the Lord.”⁵³ Around the same time, Cyprian explains that, for logistic reasons, only the true sacrament (presumably a symbolic meal) is celebrated in the presence of the whole congregation: the real supper is only for a part of the community.⁵⁴ These developments, which become visible in the third century, cannot simply be projected back to the first or second century.⁵⁵ In Hermas’ time, the Christian community meal was most likely still a real supper.⁵⁶ Even though Hermas does not explicitly refer to it, it seems that *Vis.* 3,9 and *Sim.* 9,11 allude to it.

Concluding Remarks

Hermas alludes to the Eucharist in *Vis.* 3,9 and *Sim.* 9,11. In *Vis.* 3,9 Hermas criticizes believers (“children” of the woman church, vv. 1, 9) who have (vv. 2, 4–6) for not sharing their provisions (ἀσυγχρασία, v. 4; also vv. 2–3, 5) with the have-nots (vv. 2, 4–6). Furthermore, there is critique on those among the haves

-
- 51 Pace H. LIETZMANN, *Messe und Herrenmahl. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Liturgie* (AKG, 8), Bonn, Marcus und Weber, 1926, p. 257: “...die Abtrennung der Eucharistie von der Agape und ihre Verlegung in den Morgengottesdienst”; and G.J.M. BARTELINK, *Twee apologeten uit het vroege christendom: Justinus en Athenagoras*, Kampen, Kok, 1986, p. 15: “Bij Justinus is de verbinding van de sacramentele maaltijd met een gemeenschappelijk maal van de gemeente niet meer aanwezig. De dienst werd nu met de woorddienst verbonden. De vroegere avondvieringen gingen over in de liefdesmalen (agapen), die losstonden van de cultus en die in dienst stonden van de weldadigheid”. For the Christian service of prayer and worship on Sunday morning, the earliest witness is Pliny, *Ep.* 10,96,7.
- 52 See Ps. Hippolytus, *Trad. ap.* 22 (ed. BOTTE), resp. 26.
- 53 *Ibid.*, 26 (ed. BOTTE): *eulogia est et non eucharistia sicut caro domini*.
- 54 See Cyprian, *Ep.* 63,16,1 (ed. DIERCKS – CLARKE): *sed cum cenamus, ad convivium nostrum plebem convocare non possumus, ut sacramenti veritatem fraternitate omni praesente celebremus*.
- 55 See ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, p. 81 n. 4 (refs. to A. MCGOWAN, *Rethinking Agape and Eucharist in Early North African Christianity*, in *StLi* 34 [2004] 165–176, p. 166; and P.F. BRADSHAW, *Eucharistic Origins*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2004, pp. 29–30, 99). It should be noted that the charitable, sustaining meal (ἁγίαση) continued to exist, at least in some Christian circles, for many centuries. See, e.g., *Trullan Synod*, canon 74 (692 CE).
- 56 Of course, this does not mean that the meal may not have been symbolic as well.

(see esp. τέκνα in vv. 1 and 9; the second person plural throughout vv. 1–10; and εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς in vv. 2 and 10) who are in leading positions in the church (οἱ προηγούμενοι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, see also *Vis.* 2,2,6; cf. 2,4,3) for not correcting this antisocial behaviour (vv. 2, 9–10). The use of πρωτοκαθεδρίται for (some of) them may well imply that they act antisocially themselves, because the term probably means “those who desire to have the first seats at meals” (cf. Mark 12,39; Matt 23,6; and Luke 20,46). The striking similarities between Hermas’ critique in *Vis.* 3,9 and Paul’s critique on the celebration of the Lord’s Supper at Corinth in 1 Cor 11,17–34 indicate that both authors are dealing with a similar topic: the Eucharist.⁵⁷

In *Sim.* 9,11,8 the δεῖπνον which is referred to (ἐδείπνησα[ς]) might hint at the Lord’s Supper, because the being together of Hermas and the women probably alludes to the Christian assembly. In the first and second century, the Christian community meal was a real supper. On the basis of *Vis.* 3,9 and *Sim.* 9,11, it seems justified to conclude that the author Hermas was familiar with Eucharistic meals as real suppers.

57	See esp.	1 Cor 11	<i>Vis.</i> 3,9
		προλαμβάνει (v. 21)	μεταλαμβάνετε (v. 2)
		ἀσθενεῖς (v. 30)	ἀσθένειαν (v. 3)
		κρίμα (vv. 29, 34)	κρίσις (v. 5)
		παιδεύμεθα (v. 32)	παιδεύειν, παιδεῖαν, παιδεύετε (v. 10)
		ὅς πεινᾷ . . . μὴ ἔχοντας*	μὴ ἔχοντες . . . οἱ πεινῶντες* (vv. 3, 5)
		(vv. 21–22)	

* This combination of words (πεινάω—μὴ ἔχοντες) occurs in the New Testament only in 1 Cor 11 and in *Herms* only in *Vis.* 3,9.

The Sunday Collection

1 Frequency, Day and Occasion

It has been assumed that *Hermas* implies a weekly collection on Sunday.¹ In *Sim.* 9,26,2 deacons (διάκονοι) are said to “have obtained for themselves from the service which they received to serve” (ἐαυτοῖς περιποιησάμενοι ἐκ τῆς διακονίας ἧς ἔλαβον διακονήσαι), to the disadvantage of widows and orphans.² This has been taken as evidence for a church fund. Some interpreters think that it were deacons who administered the community’s help to the needy.³ But it is uncertain whether deacons were the only ones entrusted with this service.⁴ The fact that deacons are mentioned here may just be a matter of terminology (διάκονος, διακονία, διακονέω). It is generally believed that embezzlement of money is involved.⁵ But what the deacons received may have been financial as well as material gifts.⁶ In the Greco-Roman world, collecting money or goods for the needy was customary for a variety of (religious) associations.⁷

1 See LEUTZSCH, *Wahrnehmung*, p. 136: “die sonntägliche Kollekte”.

2 See also OSIEK, *Rich and Poor*, p. 47 n. 15: “church officials who misuse funds destined for the needy are singled out”.

3 See ALIKIN, *Early History*, p. 271: “According to the *Pastor Hermas*, the task of administering the congregation’s help to the destitute was assigned to deacons”.

4 BROX, *Hirt*, p. 520, thinks this service is the responsibility of all believers. In any case, deacons do not seem to have been the only ones responsible for taking care of the needy. See, e.g., *Sim.* 9,27,2: “the bishops (οἱ ... ἐπίσκοποι) always protected (ἐσκέπασαν) the needy (τοὺς ὑπερημένους) and the widows (τὰς χήρας) in their ministry (τῇ διακονίᾳ ἐαυτῶν)”.

5 See BROX, *Hirt*, p. 451: “schamlose Bereicherung statt selbstloses Dienen”; p. 520: “Es gehört zur Aufgabe der Diakone, Geld an Mittellose ... zu verteilen”; WANSINK, *Autobiographical Insights*, p. 80: misuse of money; LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 494 n. 426: “Veruntreuung von Gemeindegeldern”; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 249: “the corrupt ministers ... have enriched themselves from church funds intended for the needy”. But cf. ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, p. 271: “*Hermas* makes mention of deacons who abused their responsibilities and profited themselves from what should have been given to the widows and orphans”. Alikin’s formulation rightly keeps various options open. Pace H. HAGEMANN, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, in *ThQ* 42 (1860) 1–40, p. 30, who thinks that the famine under Antoninus Pius (138–161 CE) is at the background.

6 See, e.g., *Did. ap.* 2,25 (ed. FUNK), where food as well as clothes are mentioned.

7 See ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, pp. 268–274.

For *Hermas* it remains unknown to what extent collections of money or goods were organized, centralized and institutionalized.⁸

There is no evidence in *Hermas* that collections took place on a weekly basis, on Sunday, or in the Christian assembly.⁹ Frequency, day and context are not mentioned. A weekly basis cannot be taken for granted: perhaps gifts were given on occasion. Furthermore, in *Hermas*' time, Christians gathered not only

8 Cf. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 249: "Such a reference presupposes already some kind of centralized organization for distribution of relief". According to Justin Martyr, *1 Apol.* 67,6 (ed. MINNS – PARVIS), collections were deposited with the president (τὸ συλλεγόμενον παρὰ τῷ προεστῶτι ἀποτίθεται) who took care of the needy. ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, pp. 270–271, takes this to mean that the president of the Christian congregation received, kept and distributed money to the needy, and comments further that it is unlikely that "the bishop alone took care of all these people". Yet, the evidence in Justin Martyr does not prove that there was one centralized church fund.

9 It is often argued that 1 Cor 16,1–3 is evidence for a weekly collection during the Sunday gatherings. There is no sufficient evidence, however, to assume that the collection took place during the Christian assembly. See, e.g., ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, p. 268 (ref. to N.H. YOUNG, 'The Use of Sunday for Meetings of Believers in the New Testament': A Response, in *NovT* 45 [2003] 111–122, pp. 112–114). Justin Martyr, *1 Apol.* 67,6–7, is the first early Christian author who explicitly mentions the weekly collection in the Christian assembly. But note that Tertullian, *Apol.* 39,5–6 (ed. BECKER), refers to a (voluntary) contribution on a monthly basis, or whenever one wished (*menstrua die, vel cum velit et si modo velit et si modo possit*). This indicates that a weekly collection on Sunday was not a general practice in all Christian communities.

Pace R.S. NASH, *1 Corinthians* (Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary), Macon, GA, Smyth & Helwys, 2009, p. 441: "On the first day of the week, the day that they [i.e., the Corinthians] assemble . . . in the context of worship, they are to collect and store the contributions". Nash lists various passages that would refer to the collection (p. 440): Rom 15,25 ("serving", *diakonōn*), 31; 2 Cor 8,4; 9,1,13 ("service", *diakonia*); Rom 15,26; 2 Cor 9,13 ("sharing", *koinōnia*); Rom 15,28 ("fruit", *karpos*); 1 Cor 16,1–2 ("contribution", *logeia*); 16,3; 2 Cor 8,6; 7,19 ("gift", *charin*); 2 Cor 8,20 ("generosity", *androtēs*); and 9,11 ("offering", *leitourgia*). His list is based on what he calls "Paul's Terms for the Collection" (p. 440).

But these terms do not necessarily refer to a "collection"; they may refer to individual initiatives. Compare the use of the above-mentioned terms in *Hermas*. For *διακονία* κτλ., see *Man.* 2,6; *Sim.* 1,9; 2,8; 9,26,2; and 9,27,2. For *καρπός* κτλ., *Sim.* 2,1,3–4.8. For *λειτουργία* κτλ., *Sim.* 5,3,3.8. (In other passages in *Hermas*, the terms of Nash's list are not related to charity: *διακονία*, *διακονέω*, *Vis.* 3,5,1; *Man.* 12,3,3; and *Sim.* 8,4,1–2; *κοινωνός*, *Man.* 4,1,5; *καρπός*, *καρποφορέω*, *Sim.* 4,3,5.8; 5,2,4; 8,1,18; 8,2,1–2; 8,3,7; 8,4,6; 8,5,6; 9,1,10; 9,19,2; and 9,28,1,3–4; *χάρις*, *Man.* 5,1,5; 10,3,1; 12,3,3; and *Sim.* 5,2,10; *λειτουργέω*, *Man.* 5,1,2–3; *Sim.* 7,6; and 9,27,3). This shows that the terms of Nash's list that occur in *Hermas* and possibly have a similar meaning, may (see esp. *Sim.* 9,26,2), but do not necessarily refer to "the collection".

on Sundays, but also on other days of the week.¹⁰ Finally, the setting is not necessarily the Christian assembly. In *Hermas* the existence of house churches is implied. Gifts may have been brought to these houses on the occasion of some gathering, or just when it suited the giver. Perhaps the gifts were not brought by the benefactor, but collected from the giver. Instead of one church fund, there may have been more, possibly managed by the heads of the households. A Sunday collection in the Christian assembly cannot be substantiated.

2 Personal Help

In *Hermas* evidence for some kind of church fund(s) intended for the needy is limited.¹¹ Social help is mainly described in terms of personal initiatives, as the following examples show.¹² In *Vis.* 3,9,5 believers who have more than enough (οἱ ὑπερέχοντες) are exhorted to search (ἐκζητεῖτε) for the hungry (τοὺς πεινῶντας). In this example, helping the needy is not a matter of contributing to an organized collection, but of personal help.

This also goes for *Man.* 2,4–6. The giver is referred to in the singular.¹³ The recipients are an unspecified group.¹⁴ It is stated that the giver should not bother about whom to give and whom not to give (τίνι δῶς ἢ τίνι μὴ δῶς, v. 4; τίνι δῶ ἢ μὴ δῶ, v. 6), which indicates that the giving takes place on a personal level. It is taken into account that recipients may be hypocrites (οἱ δὲ ἐν ὑποκρίσει

10 See ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, pp. 88–91 (with refs.).

11 See esp. *Sim.* 9,26,2.

12 The examples are taken from the *Visions*, *Mandates* and *Similitudes*. See also *Man.* 8,10—God's servants (v. 6) should, among other things, "help widows, visit orphans and needy people, and rescue God's servants from distress" (χήραις ὑπηρετεῖν καὶ ὀρφάνους καὶ ὑστερουμένους ἐπισκέπτεσθαι, ἐξ ἀναγκῶν λυτροῦσθαι τοὺς δοῦλους τοῦ θεοῦ) and "should not put pressure on debtors and needy people" (χρεώστας μὴ θλίβειν καὶ ἐνδεεῖς). OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 130, comments that this has to do "with organized activity on behalf of those in need, either coordinated by church leaders or practiced independently by patrons who can afford to do so: consideration for poor debtors, ransoming Christians from distress. The latter is part of a long Christian tradition that in this context must mean buying out those imprisoned for faith or enslaved in oppressive situations". See also C. OSIEK, *The Ransom of Captives: Evolution of a Tradition*, in *HTR* 74 (1981) 365–386, pp. 371–373. There is no evidence, however, that the support involves organized, coordinated activities.

13 See *Man.* 2,4, ἐργάζου... σου... σοι... δίδου... διστάζων... δῶς... δῶς... δίδου (referring to *Hermas*); 6, ὁ οὖν διδοὺς... ἐστιν... ἔλαβεν... ἐτέλεσεν... διακρίνων... δῶ... δῶ... ὁ... διακονῶν... ζήσεται (referring to "the one who gives"); 7, φύλασσε... σοι... σου... σου (referring to *Hermas*).

14 See esp. *Man.* 2,4, πᾶσιν ὑστερουμένοις... πᾶσιν... πᾶσιν; 5, οἱ λαμβάνοντες.

λαμβάνοντες, v. 5), but it is stressed that the giver does not need to investigate whether the receiver really is in need. Charity is here a personal gift.¹⁵

In *Sim.* 2, too, charity takes place between individuals.¹⁶ “Rich” and “poor” are generally referred to in the singular (ὁ πλούσιος, ὁ πτωχός/ὁ πέννης, vv. 4–7); only in v. 8 the perspective is more widely “the poor” (οἱ πένητες) and “the rich” (οἱ πλούσιοι). In v. 6 the poor recipient thanks God “for his giver” (ὕπερ τοῦ διδόντος αὐτῷ). In vv. 7 and 9 the mutual relationship between a rich and a poor person is stressed: “both (ἄμφότεροι) complete the work” (v. 7); “both (ἄμφότεροι) become partners (κοινωνοί) of the righteous work” (v. 9).

A final example is *Sim.* 9,27,2. It is about bishops (ἐπίσκοποι) and hospitable people (φιλόξενοι) who are praised for having received God’s servants into their houses. This indicates hospitality at a personal level.¹⁷ Charity is throughout *Hermas* described as personal help.

15 Cf., e.g., BROX, *Hirt*, p. 195: “der Geber darf keine Unterschiede darin machen, wem er gibt. Gott will keine Armen”; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, pp. 104–105: “the problem of giving to those who might be deemed unworthy to receive . . . one should give without regard to [105] the recipient, who is accountable to God”. In these interpretations it is left open whether the giver knows the recipient or not.

16 LEUTZSCH, *Wahrnehmung*, pp. 122–124, argues that the parable refers to one-to-one relationships between two individuals (“die Beziehung zwischen genau zwei Personen”), that is, between a rich and a poor member of the Christian community who know each other personally, and that Hermas attempts to restore patron-client relationships. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 293 n. 3, rejects this view: “Daß das Bild von Ulme und Weinstock . . . dies nahelegt, scheint mir nicht der Fall zu sein”. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 164 (with refs.), argues that the text exhorts rich believers “to contribute to the common fund, which undoubtedly existed in some form” and to take on patron-client relationships on an individual level. What should be noted, however, is that Hermas exhorts the haves to give to the needy without bothering about whom to give and whom not to give. This indicates that the giving takes place on a personal level and that the people involved not always know each other very well.

17 See further *Sim.* 5,2,9 and 5,3,7, where generosity is a personal initiative. For a similar conclusion concerning *Sim.* 5,3,7, see BROX, *Hirt*, p. 313: “Wie in anderen Fällen . . . fehlt jede Anspielung auf eine kirchlich-institutionelle Ritualisierung des Vollzugs (der Geber händigt seine Gabe privat und direkt an Witwe, Waise oder Notleidenden aus)”; and ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, p. 273 n. 88: “personal distribution of alms was also practised; see, e.g., Herm., *Sim.* 5,3,7”. Pace LEUTZSCH, *Wahrnehmung*, p. 136 (on *Sim.* 5,3,7): “Versuch einer Institutionalisierung”. Cf. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 174 with n. 12: “The text does not support an interpretation of institutionalization of charitable giving, but the encouragement of a practice probably at this period carried on both by individual patronage and by a centralized collection of funds for distribution”. Osiek suggests that she agrees with Brox (“with Brox, 313”), but he would probably have disagreed with her idea of a “centralized collection”.

Another argument against the idea of organized collections is that gifts in *Hermas* do not only involve money,¹⁸ but also food,¹⁹ goods²⁰ and services.²¹ As

18 *Sim.* 1,8–9—believers with possessions are exhorted “to buy suffering souls” (ἀγοράζετε ψυχὰς θλιβομένων), to take care of (ἐπισκέπτεσθε) widows and orphans, and to use their wealth (πλοῦτον) and all their possessions (παρατάξεις πάσας) for such purposes (v. 8). BROX, *Hirt*, p. 288, gives three possible interpretations of ἀγοράζετε ψυχὰς θλιβομένων: to ransom Christian slaves, to ransom Christian prisoners, or to support the needy financially. The first is argued by, e.g., H. GÜLZOW, *Christentum und Sklaverei in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Bonn, Habelt, 1969, p. 89; H.-J. DREXHAGE, *Wirtschaft und Handel in den frühchristlichen Gemeinden (1.–3. Jh. n. Chr.)*, in *RQ* 76 (1981) 1–72, p. 38; and LEUTZSCH, *Wahrnehmung*, pp. 61–62, 128 with n. 81, 135, 141–142. Cf. Ignatius, *Pol.* 4,2 (ed. EHRMAN), who states that slaves should not expect to be freed at the community’s expense. The second by OSIEK, *Ransom*, pp. 372, 381–382. A combination of the first and second (slaves as well as prisoners) by GEBHARDT – HARNACK, *Hermas Pastor*, p. 135. The third by OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 160, who keeps the three options open, but seems to have some preference for the third: “the first level of meaning . . . relates to simple helping of those in need”. This (third) option is the most likely one. The direct context mentions “widows and orphans” and ἀγοράζετε indicates that money is involved (see also *Sim.* 5,3,7: τὴν ποσότητα τῆς δαπάνης, “amount of money”).

19 See, e.g., *Vis.* 3,9: “do not only (for yourselves) take the things that God created from what is poured out (ἐκ καταχύματος), but give also to the needy (τοῖς ὑστερουμένοις, v. 2)”. Most likely, what is (to be) given is food: those who have “much food” (πολλὴν ἐδεσμάτων, v. 3) are contrasted with “those who do not have (enough) food” (μὴ ἐχόντων ἐδεσματα/μὴ ἔχειν τὸ ἀρκετὸν τῆς τροφῆς, v. 3). If *Eucharistic* meals are meant (see Chapter 8), it should be noted that food and drink at these meals may well have been more than just bread and wine. See ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, pp. 271–272 with nn. 84–85 (no ref. to *Hermas*).

Man. 2,4—the Shepherd says to Hermas: “give . . . from (the fruits of) your labour” (ἐκ τῶν κόπων σου . . . δίδου, v. 4). κόπος (“work”, “toil”) is here an *abstractum pro concreto* (see also BAUER – ALAND, *Wörterbuch*, p. 901). A good parallel is *Sim.* 9,24,2–3, which refers to believers who “from (the fruits of) their labour supported everyone” (ἐκ τῶν κοπῶν αὐτῶν παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐχορήγησαν, v. 2), so that the Lord “made them prosper in (the fruits of) the labour of their hands and bestowed favour on them in every activity of theirs” (ἐπλήθυνεν αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς κόποις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐχαρίτωσεν αὐτοὺς ἐν πάσῃ πράξει αὐτῶν, v. 3). As the parallel indicates, κόπος probably refers to the yield (goods) and not to the proceeds (money) of the believers’ work. Most likely, the gifts are food. In *Man.* 2,4 the yield of Hermas’ field may be meant (see *Vis.* 3,1,2). Pace LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 193, who translates τῶν κόπων σου with “aus deinem Arbeitslohn”; and p. 444 n. 24 (ref. to A. VON HARNACK, *Κόπος (κοπιάν, οἱ κοπιῶντες) im frühchristlichen Sprachgebrauch*, in *ZNW* 27 [1928] 1–10): “κοποι = Arbeitslohn, Ertrag der Arbeit wie *sim* IX 24, 2f.”. “Arbeitslohn” (wages) is, however, not the most likely meaning of κοποι in *Sim.* 9,24,2–3. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 195, translates: “Ertrag der Arbeit”, a somewhat ambivalent translation, because it can mean yield of labour (goods) as well as income of labour (money). But cf. p. 296: “weil man zum Almosen eben Geld braucht”, which indicates that Brox regards charity as

Sim. 5,3,7 indicates, food takes a prominent place. Here the gift is money, but it is a means to buy food. Money (τὴν ποσότητα τῆς δαπάνης) is saved by the giver by buying less food (fasting) and spent by the recipient by buying food. Personal help is meant to satisfy the hunger of a needy person (ἴνα . . . ὁ εἰληφῶς ἐμπλήσῃ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν).²² In the preceding examples support of the needy does not mean contributing to any church fund, but providing personal help.

3 Give and Take

The idea that all community members “passed the hat round” to collect money is a misrepresentation. In *Hermas* the givers are only the rich or better-off.²³ This is less obvious than it seems. Justin Martyr, for instance, finds it necessary to specify that *the prosperous* (οἱ εὐποροῦντες) contribute to the weekly

giving money, so he most likely thinks of κόπος as income. Another argument for the interpretation “yield” is that in *Sim.* 9,24 the direct context refers to agriculture. See v. 1: “plants” (βοτάναι) and “all sorts of domestic animals” (πάν γένος κτηνῶν). In *Sim.* 9,24,2–3 the intended gifts are probably food. Cf. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 248, who does not interpret the plants and animals as food for humans: “The mountain contains every good kind of plant that feeds animals and birds”.

Sim. 5,2,9—the οἰκοδεσπότης sends his slave food of a banquet (ἐδέσματα ἐκ τοῦ δείπνου πολλὰ). The slave only keeps what he needs (τὰ ἀρκούντα) and divides the rest of the food (τὰ ἐδέσματα) among his fellow-slaves (v. 9).

- 20 See *Sim.* 2,5,8—the rich is to support the poor with “the necessary things” (τὰ δέοντα). Most likely, goods are meant. χρήματα (v. 5) can mean either money or possessions (BAUER – ALAND, *Wörterbuch*, p. 1765), but πλοῦτος (vv. 5,7–8; cf. v. 10: πλουτίζονται) usually means wealth in the sense of having many material goods (BAUER – ALAND, *Wörterbuch*, p. 1355: “eigtl. v. Besitz vieler irdischer Güter”).

- 21 See *Sim.* 9,27,2—hospitality (φιλόξενοι . . . ὑπεδέξαντο) and protection (ἐσκέπασαν) of the needy (τοὺς ὑστερημένους) and widows (τὰς χήρας). Cf. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 250: “reception of travelers and charity to the local needy”.

- 22 For the translation “satisfies his hunger”, see also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 313; LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 472 n. 90; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 174. Pace DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 567.

- 23 The givers are primarily described as the “haves” and the “rich”. For the haves, see esp. *Vis.* 3,9,4 (ὁμῖν τοῖς ἔχουσι), 5 (οἱ ὑπερέχοντες); *Sim.* 2,10 (οἱ ἔχοντες); and *Sim.* 10,4,4 (*quicumque accepistis . . . a domino*). For the rich, *Vis.* 3,9,6 (“you who take pride in your wealth”, ὑμεῖς οἱ γαυριώμενοι ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ ὑμῶν); *Sim.* 1,1,4–5,8; 2,4–7 (ὁ πλούσιος), 8 (οἱ πλούσιοι). For others, esp. *Sim.* 5,2,9: the head of the household (ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης), who is the landlord (owner of the vineyard) and slave owner, gives his slave much food. The slave, in his turn (now being one of the haves), gives food to his fellow-slaves; and *Sim.* 9,27,2: the bishops (ἐπίσκοποι) and hospitable people (φιλόξενοι) are presumably community members who were able to receive fellow-believers into their houses.

collection in the Christian assembly.²⁴ In *Hermas* only the haves are addressed. *Vis.* 3,9, for instance, which deals with an internal church issue (vv. 1–2),²⁵ speaks of “you who have” and “those who have not” (vv. 2, 4–6). In *Man.* 2,4 the Shepherd says to Hermas (“you”, sg.): “give . . . from (the fruits of) your labour . . . to *all* the destitute” (ἐκ τῶν κόπων σου . . . πᾶσιν ὑστερουμένοις δίδου). In *Sim.* 1 “you” (pl.) refers to believers (ὁμείς, οἱ δούλοι τοῦ θεοῦ, v. 1) who are wealthy (πλούτον, v. 8), having possessions (παρατάξεις, v. 8) like fields (ἀγροί, vv. 1, 4–5, 8), expensive items (παρατάξεις πολυτελείς, v. 1), houses (οικοδομαί/οικήματα, v. 1; οἰκήσεις, v. 4; οἰκίαι, vv. 4, 8) and many other things (ὑπάρξεις, vv. 4–5). They are exhorted to support the needy (vv. 8–9): “suffering souls” (ψυχὰς θλιβομένης), “widows and orphans” (χήρας καὶ ὀρφανούς) and symbolic “fields and houses” (ἀγρούς καὶ οἰκίας). As these few examples illustrate, only the haves are addressed and only the rich or better-off are supposed to give for charity.

The recipients are only the needy.²⁶ This may seem an open door, but it should be noted that the recipients do not seem to be, for instance, church ministers or travelling preachers,²⁷ communities in other regions,²⁸ etc. Overall the needy seem to be believers,²⁹ but the perspective may be broader.³⁰ There are two categories: those who really are in trouble and those who could do

24 See Justin Martyr, *1 Apol.* 67,6 (ed. MINNS – PARVIS).

25 This is scholarly consensus, see esp. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 474–475; BROX, *Hirt*, p. 148; LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 422 n. 396; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 81.

26 For (pre-eminent) objects of charity, cf. Ignatius, *Smyrn.* 6,2 (ed. EHRMAN): widows, orphans, oppressed, prisoners, released, hungry, thirsty; Justin Martyr, *1 Apol.* 67,6–7 (ed. MINNS – PARVIS): orphans, widows, ill, prisoners, travellers; Tertullian, *Apol.* 39,5–6 (ed. BECKER): the poor, orphans, elderly slaves, shipwrecked mariners, those who are in mines, on islands or in prison; and *Did. ap.* 2,25 (ed. FUNK): deacons, widows, orphans, poor, travellers (i.e., church ministers and those in need).

27 For the support of the clergy, see ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, pp. 273–274. It is uncertain whether the travellers mentioned in *Sim.* 9,27,2 are preachers. Cf. *Did.* 13,4 (ed. EHRMAN): “if you have no prophet (προφήτην), give to the poor (πτωχοῖς)”.

28 For this practice, cf. the letter of bishop Dionysius of Corinth to the church in Rome (c. 170 CE) in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4,23,10 (ed. BARDY).

29 See esp. *Sim.* 2,2: the elm and vine are εἰς τύπον . . . τοῖς δούλοις τοῦ θεοῦ; and v. 4: “this parable is thus about the servants of God (τοὺς δούλους τοῦ θεοῦ), poor and rich (πτωχὸν καὶ πλούσιον)”. See also BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 293–294.

30 See esp. *Man.* 2,4—“all the destitute” (πᾶσιν ὑστερουμένοις), “give to all!” (πᾶσιν δίδου); *Sim.* 9,24,2—“every person” (πάντα ἄνθρωπον . . . παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ); and *Sim.* 10,4,2—every human (*omnem hominem*). But this does not necessarily mean “every human being on earth”: maybe it is taken for granted that only believers are in view (“every believer”). See further *Sim.* 9,27,1–2, where the use of πιστεύσαντες, ἐπίσκοποι, δούλοι τοῦ θεοῦ and (the bishop’s) διακονία indicates that the hospitality and protection involve generosity among believers.

with some help.³¹ A collection rather than personal help does not seem to be envisioned.

Concluding Remarks

In *Hermas* there is no evidence for a weekly collection of money in the Sunday gatherings of the Christian assembly. Proof of some kind of collective church fund(s) intended for the needy is limited (esp. *Sim.* 9,26,2). Frequency, day and context of a possible collection are not mentioned. Gifts are not only money (*Sim.* 1,8 and 5,3,7), but also food (*Vis.* 3,9,2–3; *Man.* 2,4; *Sim.* 5,2,9; and 9,24,1–3), goods (*Sim.* 2,5,8) and services (*Sim.* 9,27,2). Support of the needy is not described as contributing to any collection, but as providing personal help (*Vis.* 3,9,5; *Man.* 2,4–6; *Sim.* 2,4–9; and 9,27,2).

31 For those who are in trouble, see esp. *Sim.* 10,4,2 (*omnem hominem... incommodo... qui eget... in magno tormento et necessitate*), 3 (*incommodo vexatur... cruciatur... angustiam*). For the poor, see *Sim.* 2,4 (ὁ πτωχός), 5–7 (ὁ πένης), 8 (οἱ πένητες). Cf. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 163 n. 10: “Some difference was understood between the two words for ‘poor’, though the difference was often blurred as here: the πτωχός lived in want and dependence on others, while the πένης by working hard could be independent yet have the bare necessities”. For the hungry, see *Vis.* 3,9,3 (μὴ ἐχόντων ἐδέσματα/μὴ ἔχειν τὸ ἀρκετὸν τῆς τροφῆς), 5 (οἱ πεινῶντες). For the destitute (ὑστερούμενοι), see *Vis.* 3,9,2.4.6; *Man.* 2,4; *Sim.* 5,3,7; and 9,27,2. For those who are in trouble, see *Man.* 2,5 (θλιβόμενοι); and *Sim.* 1,8 (ψυχὰί θλιβομέναι). For widows (χήραι), see *Sim.* 1,8 and 9,27,2; for orphans (ὀρφανοί), *Sim.* 1,8 and 5,3,7. Note that in *Sim.* 1,8 widows are mentioned in relation to ψυχὰί θλιβομέναι; and in *Sim.* 5,3,7 widows and orphans in relation to the destitute (χήρα... ὀρφανῶ... ὑστερουμένῳ). For those who could do with some help, see esp. *Sim.* 5,2,9 (the slaves who receive food from their fellow-slave); and *Sim.* 9,27,2 (people [travellers] who are welcomed by bishops and other hospitable people).

Dancing (and Singing)

“Dancing is no form of expression of the Christian liturgy. Gnostic-docetic circles have tried to introduce it into the liturgy around the third century . . . No Christian rite includes dancing”.¹ Dancing in the Christian assembly is a controversial issue. As the citation shows, it has been claimed that there is no evidence that dancing took place in early Christian gatherings and that “the church” has always rejected it. It is true that there are no direct testimonies of Christian liturgical dances before the third century,² but it is too easy to draw the above-mentioned conclusions. First, dancing and singing were sometimes understood as two aspects of the same act:³ χορεύειν, which signifies the activity of a choir (χορός), denotes choral singing as much as choral dance.⁴ Singing appears to have been part of the Christian gatherings from the early beginnings.⁵

1 See J. RATZINGER, *Der Geist der Liturgie. Eine Einführung*, Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 2000, pp. 170–172, p. 170: “Der Tanz ist keine Ausdrucksform christlicher Liturgie. Gnostisch-doketische Kreise haben ihn etwa im 3. Jahrhundert in die Liturgie einzuführen versucht . . . Kein christlicher Ritus kennt den Tanz”.

2 See M. KLINGHARDT, *Tanz und Offenbarung. Praxis und Theologie des gottesdienstlichen Tanzes im frühen Christentum*, in *SpCh* 15–16 (2004–2005) 11–34, pp. 11, 28.

3 For this reason, the present chapter, which is, in fact, about dancing, is entitled “dancing (and singing)”.

4 See KLINGHARDT, *Tanz*, p. 15.

5 For singing in Christian gatherings, see, e.g., 1 Cor 14,15,26; Mark 14,26; Col 3,16; Eph 5,18–19; Jas 5,13; Ignatius, *Rom.* 2,2 (ed. EHRMAN); Justin Martyr, *1 Apol.* 13,1–2 (ed. MINNS – PARVIS); Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 2,43,1,3; 44,1,3–4 (ed. MARCOVICH); Tertullian, *Apol.* 39,18 (ed. BECKER); and Pliny, *Ep.* 19,96,8 (ed. RADICE). Christian gatherings (on Sunday afternoon) originally consisted of a δεῖπνον and an after-dinner session. Christians adopted the practice of singing from similar bipartite gatherings of other contemporary associations. See H.J. DE JONGE, *Avondmaal en symposium. Oorsprong en eerste ontwikkeling van de vroegchristelijke samenkomst. Afscheidsrede Universiteit Leiden*, Leiden, 2007, pp. 5, 11; and ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, pp. 211–215. Pace, e.g., C.H. KRAELING, *Music in the Bible*, in E. WELLEZ (ed.), *New Oxford History of Music. I. Ancient and Oriental Music*, London, Oxford University Press, 1957, pp. 283–312, p. 303, who traces the singing of Christians back to that in the Jewish synagogues; J. MEGGITT, *The First Churches: Religious Practice*, in J. BARTON, *The Biblical World*. 11, London – New York, Routledge, 2002, p. 163; and MEEKS, *Social and Ecclesial Life*, p. 167, who trace it back to Hellenistic (Greco-Roman as well as Jewish) cultic singing. For singing at gatherings, consisting of a meal and an after-dinner session, see, e.g., Mark 14,26; Petronius,

Some of the references to singing may imply dancing. Second, there is some indirect evidence that dancing took place in early Christian gatherings.⁶ In what follows, it will be argued that the dancing of Hermas and the virgins in *Sim.* 9,11,4–5 reflects an early Christian custom of dancing in the context of a Christian gathering.

1 Dancing in a Christian Gathering

In *Sim.* 9,11,4–5 Hermas and the virgins dance in various ways. The virgins lead Hermas around the tower (περιάγειν κύκλῳ τοῦ πύργου, v. 4). Hermas notes that “some of them [the virgins] danced in chorus, others were dancing and again others were singing” (αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐχόρευον, αἱ δὲ ὠρχοῦντο, αἱ δὲ ᾄδον),⁷ but that he “kept silent, going around the tower with them” (ἐγὼ δὲ σιγῇν ἔχων μετ’ αὐτῶν κύκλῳ τοῦ πύργου περιεπάτου). It seems that the going around the tower involves dancing.⁸ The fact that Hermas is led by the virgins may mean that they dance around the tower hand in hand.⁹

Sat. 109 (ed. MÜLLER); Longus, *Daphn.* 2,31,1–3 (ed. HENDERSON); 4,38,3; Plutarch, *Quaest. conv.* 1,615A–C (ed. HOFFLEIT); 622A.C; 2,643B; 3,645A; 7,711D (ed. MINAR – SANDBACH – HELMBOLD); 712F; 713B; 9,736E–F; 743C; Philo, *Spec.* 2,148 (ed. DANIEL); and *Contempl.* 80.84–85 (ed. DAUMAS – MIQUEL). See further DE JONGE, *Avondmaal en symposium*, pp. 5.11.14.16; and ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, pp. 211–227. The Jewish, Christian and Greco-Roman parallels are all witnesses to a general phenomenon of singing at banquets and symposia.

- 6 A possible witness is Melito of Sardis, *Homily on Passover* 80 (ed. LOHSE). For this example, see KLINGHARDT, *Tanz*, p. 28 n. 79. In the homily the “feast” of the disciples is contrasted with the suffering of Jesus: σὺ ἔπινες οἶνον καὶ ἄρτον ἡσθίεις . . . σὺ ἔψαλλες . . . σὺ ἐχόρευες. This does not prove that dancing was part of the early Christian “liturgy”, yet it does seem to reflect a Christian practice of dancing (and singing) within the context of a meal and symposium.
- 7 αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐχόρευον, αἱ δὲ ὠρχοῦντο, αἱ δὲ ᾄδον is attested in A (accepted by WHITTAKER; LEUTZSCH; and EHRMAN). Of the three verbs, L¹ only reads the third and the first; L² only the first and the third; and E only the third and the second. The readings of L¹ L² and E are probably secondary, because all three involve a *lectio facilior*: it is more likely that they have omitted one of the two words for dancing than that A would have changed one verb into two verbs.
- 8 For the idea that the dancing and going around the tower are part of the same ritual, see also, e.g., BROX, *Hirt*, p. 411: “Die Führung um den Turm gehört vermutlich zum Reigen”.
- 9 For the idea that Hermas is active in dancing, see, e.g., BROX, *Hirt*, p. 411. Cf. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 618: “er spielt mit, ist aber doch im ganzen der passive Teil”; and JOLY, *Hermas*, p. 314: “[Hermas] reste toujours passif”. Most likely, *Sim.* 9,11,5 implies that Hermas did not sing (but kept silent), yet did (actively) go/dance with the women around the tower.

Several elements of the story indicate that the meeting of Hermas and the virgins as brother and sisters (v. 3), during which the dancing takes place, alludes to the Christian assembly. The context is that of the tower/church. It is repeated time and again that the gathering takes place near the tower (vv. 4–6). The virgins lead Hermas “around the tower” (κύκλω τοῦ πύργου, v. 4). They dance (and sing) while Hermas goes with them “around the tower” (κύκλω τοῦ πύργου, v. 5). Hermas stays overnight “near the tower” (παρὰ τὸν πύργον, v. 6). Shortly after the scene the Shepherd explains to Hermas that the tower is the church (ὁ πύργος . . . οὗτος ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐστίν, *Sim.* 9.13,1). It is somehow remarkable that commentators have not stressed (or even noted) the “church” setting.¹⁰

Furthermore, the meeting has, that is to say, is meant to have, a similar structure to the early Christian gatherings. These consisted of two parts: a meal (δεῖπνον) and an after-dinner session (συμπόσιον). As such, the Christian gatherings conformed to the common socio-cultural pattern of periodical meetings, consisting of a banquet plus a symposium, which were held by all sorts of Hellenistic associations, clubs and groups throughout the Jewish and Greco-Roman world.¹¹ *Sim.* 9.11 alludes to this bipartite pattern of a supper and an after-supper session: the Shepherd’s question what Hermas has eaten (ἐδείπνησας) and Hermas’ answer that he has “dined (ἐδείπνησα) . . . on

10 DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 617, takes *Sim.* 9.11,4–6 as a “game of love” (“Minnespiel”) without religious connotations: “was . . . in 4–6 geschildert wird, ist nichts anderes als ein wirkliches Minnespiel . . . Während vorher [i.e., before v. 7] jedes religiöse Moment gefehlt hat”. O. LUSCHNAT, *Die Jungfrauenszene in der Arkadienvision des Hermas*, in *ThViat* 12 (1973–1974) 53–70, p. 59, explains the dancing around the tower from parallels in pagan literature of cultic dances around “something” (“um etwas herumtanzen”, italics mine), thereby ignoring the fact that in *Hermas* the dancing takes place around the tower which represents the church. Cf. BROX, *Hirt*, p. 408: “die Jungfrauengeschichte hat von Haus aus nichts mit der Turmbau-Parabel zu tun”; p. 411: “Das Herumtanzen um einen Mittelpunkt . . . Daß dieser Mittelpunkt der Turm ist, lenkt auf die Parabel zurück und verzahnt vorliegende Geschichte wieder mit dem Kontext (vgl. 11,3)”; and pp. 411–412: “Die Ortsangabe ‘neben dem Turm (παρὰ τὸν πύργον)’ ist hier zur Verklammerung der Jungfrauengeschichte mit dem Turmbaugleichnis eingesetzt”. LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 487 n. 302, interprets the going around the tower as a *circumambulatio* of which the exact meaning is unclear. Further, he interprets *Sim.* 9.11 from the walk around the tower in 9.9,6 and 9.10.1. The action and terminology (περιπατεῖν κύκλω τοῦ πύργου) are quite similar, but the function is different: in 9,6 and 10.1 it is a way to inspect the tower; in 11,4–5, it is part of a ritual which involves dancing and singing. OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 228, comments that, “The whole scene takes place next to the tower”, but she does not conclude that a church setting is involved.

11 For this thesis, see esp. KLINGHARDT, *Gemeinschaftsmahl*.

the words of the Lord" (v. 8) hint at the former; the prayer, which is clearly a religious element in the story (v. 7), at the latter.¹² The dancing is a ritual in the context of a meeting which alludes to the Christian assembly.

2 Parallels

In the literature on *Hermas* there is a tendency to designate the dancing as a pagan element and to explain it by randomly selecting all sorts of parallels of the phenomenon dance.¹³ The present chapter will use a different approach. It will focus on dances in the context of banquets and symposia.¹⁴ Such dances are widely attested in Jewish, Christian and pagan literature.

12 KLINGHARDT, *Tanz*, does not note that in *Sim.* 9,11 the bipartite pattern of dinner and after-dinner session is present.

13 See, e.g., DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, who distinguishes between "Christian" and "worldly" elements of the passage (pp. 617–618): he takes the prayer (v. 7) and the "words of the Lord" (v. 8) as Christian motives, and the rest, including the choral dance and dancing, as worldly elements (p. 618): "Dagegen deuten folgende Züge auf ausgesprochen weltliche und zwar erotische Zusammenhänge . . . 3) sie [i.e., the virgins] unterhalten ihn [i.e., Hermas] mit Spiel, Reigen, Tanz und Gesang". Concerning the worldly elements, Dibelius thinks that these "un-Christian" and "un-Jewish" elements are to be explained from pagan, erotic literature (p. 618): "Alle diese Züge sind unter urchristlichen Voraussetzungen völlig unerklärlich . . . Die beiden christlichen Motive, vom Gebet und vom Wort Gottes, nehmen sich in der Tat wie Fremdkörper aus. Wir haben es also wohl mit einem fremden, der außerchristlichen und außerjüdischen 'Welt' entstammenden Stoff zu tun . . . eine Schilderung aus erotischer Literatur". LUSCHNAT, *Jungfrauenszene*, p. 68 n. 12, takes the whole scene as consisting of pre-Christian elements: "... da ja klar ist, daß die ganze Szene auf vorchristlichen Vorstellungen beruht" and explains the passage from ancient Greek religion and literature which links together cult, dance and eroticism (p. 55).

14 For a similar approach, see KLINGHARDT, *Tanz*, p. 14: "Dieser Hintergrund erlaubt die Eingrenzung: Gottesdienstlicher Tanz konnte nur *sympotischer* Tanz sein, und der musste seinen Ort nach dem eigentlichen Mahl . . . haben". Klinghardt's focus on dances that take place at symposia *after* the banquet may be too limited. His approach is not completely consistent either, because he discusses the passage in *Hermas*. It is difficult to maintain, however, that in *Sim.* 9,11 the dancing takes place after a meal.

2.1 *Jewish Parallels*

A striking parallel is found in Philo of Alexandria's *De vita contemplativa*.¹⁵ Philo describes how the religious community of the Therapeutae at Lake Mareotis celebrate the feast of Pentecost (*Pannychis*).¹⁶ There are several similarities between the two passages in *Hermas* and Philo. First there is the same twofold pattern. The Therapeutae come together for a common supper (δείπνον, 66–82), followed by an all-night vigil (παννυχίδα, 83–90).¹⁷ The supper is in both writings a symbolic meal. Philo states that even though the Therapeutae do not drink any alcohol, they are in a state of “sober drunkenness” (89) because their dancing and singing is for them like drinking “undiluted wine” (85). Similarly, *Hermas* and the virgins do not eat anything, yet “dined on the words of the Lord” (*Sim.* 9,11,8). It has been suggested that the state of inspiration satisfied the hunger and quenched the thirst of the participants.¹⁸ It seems more likely, however, that it is the conviviality which makes up for the eating and drinking. The after-party lasts in both texts all night: the feast of the Therapeutae ends at sunset (89). The meeting of *Hermas* and the virgins lasts until the second hour of the next morning (*Sim.* 9,11,7). Both events have a similar twofold pattern.¹⁹

15 In the Septuagint there are several passages which refer to dancing in the context of a religious gathering, but not in the context of a banquet or symposium. See, e.g. 1 Kgs 18,26, where the prophets of Baal go (MT: “limp”, יִתְצַחֵי; LXX: “run about”, διέτρεχον) around the altar, probably in some kind of dance. For the idea that dancing is involved, see also F. BROWN – S. DRIVER – C. BRIGGS, *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*, Peabody, MA, Hendrickson, 2001⁶, p. 820. Granted that the worship of Baal has negative connotations, the dancing around the altar is presented as a religious custom. See further Ps 149,3 LXX (ed. RAHLFS): “Let them praise his name with dancing (αἰνεσάτωσαν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐν χορῷ); let them sing praises to him (ψαλάτωσαν αὐτῷ) . . .”. As the wording indicates, the first part of the verse refers back to v. 1b (ἡ αἴνεσις αὐτοῦ) and the second part to v. 1a (αἴσατε τῷ κυρίῳ ᾠσμα καινόν). Interestingly, the same opening verse of the psalm specifies that the setting is “in the assembly of saints” (ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ὁσίων). The psalm refers to dancing and singing in the context of a religious gathering.

16 See Philo, *Contempl.* 64–90 (ed. DAUMAS – MIQUEL).

17 See Philo, *Contempl.* 83 (ed. DAUMAS – MIQUEL): μετὰ δὲ τὸ δείπνον τὴν ἱερὰν ἄγουσι παννυχίδα. See also KLINGHARDT, *Tanz*, esp. pp. 15–17; and DE JONGE, *Early History*, p. 225.

18 Cf. KLINGHARDT, *Tanz*, p. 28: “So, wie *Hermas* ‘Worte des Herrn’ isst, indem er mit den Jungfrauen tanzt, stillt die Weisheit den Hunger und den Durst derer, die von ihr trinken”.

19 Philo contrasts the συμπόσια of the Greeks with those of the Therapeutae (64, ed. DAUMAS – MIQUEL). This shows that Philo regards both events as specimen of the same socio-cultural phenomenon.

Furthermore, similar themes and terms are used.²⁰ Note especially the dancing and singing,²¹ the praying,²² the description of the women,²³ the taking part of both men and women, the playing on erotic themes,²⁴ the participants' positive mood,²⁵ etc. These similarities indicate that Philo and Hermas both describe a similar phenomenon: a religious gathering with dancing as one of the main elements.²⁶

20 See also KLINGHARDT, *Tanz*, pp. 23–28.

21 In Philo several hymns are sung before the meal, see, e.g., 80 (ὑμνον ᾄδει) and 81 (ὅταν δὲ ἕκαστος διαπεράνηται τὸν ὑμνον, ed. DAUMAS – MIQUEL). After the meal (during the vigil), men and women first form their own choir (83) and sing various hymns and dance (84, ᾄδουσι... ὕμνους... ἐπιχειρονομοῦντες καὶ ἐπορχούμενοι... ἐν χορείᾳ). Afterwards, they together form a mixed choir (85). See also *Hermas*: ἐχώρευον... ὠρχοῦντο... ἡῶδον (*Sim.* 9,11,5).

22 In Philo the Therapeutae pray (89, ἐπεύχονται... μετὰ τὰς εὐχάς, ed. DAUMAS – MIQUEL; see also 66, προσεύχονται) until sunset (89, τὸν ἥλιον ἀνίσχοντα). In *Hermas* “they [i.e., the virgins] did nothing but praying” (οὐδὲν ὅλως ἐποιοῦν εἰ μὴ προσηγύχοντο) and Hermas “prayed with them constantly” (ἀδιαλείπτως προσηγυρόμην), until the second hour of the morning (9,11,7).

23 In Philo they are unmarried women of some age (γῆραιαι παρθένοι) who “have renounced the pleasures of the body and have not yearned for mortal beings, but immortal” (68, ed. DAUMAS – MIQUEL). In *Hermas* they are παρθένοι who treat Hermas “as a brother, not as a husband” (9,11,3).

24 See KLINGHARDT, *Tanz*, p. 24: “Eine... Verbindung stellen die erotischen Assoziationen dar, die durch die Vorstellung des gemeinsamen Reigentanzes geweckt werden... sowohl Philo als auch der Hirt des Hermas [geben sich] durchaus Mühe, sie zu korrigieren”. See, e.g., the term παίζειν which both authors use. For the erotic connotations of this term, see Chapter 11.

25 In both texts the participants do not get tired, even though the gathering lasts the whole night (89, resp. 9,11,7). In Philo the Therapeutae are inspired (ἐπιθειάζοντες, 84, ed. DAUMAS – MIQUEL) and enthusiastic (ἐνθουσιῶντες, 87). Hermas is in a state of happiness (ἰλαρός, v. 5). KLINGHARDT, *Tanz*, p. 27, argues that in both writings the dancing relates to ecstasy: “die Verbindung von Tanz und Ekstase”. See also p. 28: “So gehen hier Rausch und Erkenntnis, Ekstase und Weisheit bruchlos ineinander über”. Klinghardt's argument is based on *Sim.* 9,9,5 (p. 28 n. 78): “Hermas hält die Jungfrauen zunächst für ‘wild’ (ἄγριαί, *sim.* 1X 9,5), betet dann aber (nur) mit ihnen und ‘isst Worte des Herrn’”. But the γυναικες in *Sim.* 9,9,5 should not be confused with the παρθένοι in *Sim.* 9,11. Moreover, Hermas and the virgins do not seem to be in a state of “ecstasy”. Cf. C. SITTL, *Die Gebärden der Griechen und Römer*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1890; repr., Hildesheim – New York, Olms, 1970, p. 224: “Das griechische Wort ὀρχέομαι bedeutet einfach die Ekstase, sodaß es sich sowohl für Freudezeichen als für religiöse Orgien eignet”.

26 Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 2,17,18 (ed. BARDY), believes the Therapeutae to be Christian monks. KLINGHARDT, *Tanz*, p. 17, states: “Indem Euseb den gottesdienstlich-sympotischen Tanz der Therapeuten als zweifelsfrei christlich identifiziert, lässt sich Philos Bericht indirekt

2.2 Christian Parallels

It has been stated that (liturgical) dance is no theme in the New Testament.²⁷ There are several passages in the New Testament, however, which refer to dancing in the context of bipartite gatherings, consisting of a meal and an after-dinner session. For instance, in Mark's story of the birthday banquet (δεῖπνον, 6,21) given by Herod Antipas, Herodias' daughter comes in and dances (ὀρχησαμένης, v. 22).²⁸ Luke 15,23.25 describes a banquet and after-party with music and dance. At the return of his lost son, the father says: "let us eat (φαγόντες) and celebrate" (v. 23). When the elder son comes near his father's house, he hears "music and dancing (χορῶν)" (v. 25). Both Mark and Luke are witnesses to the same twofold pattern: a meal and an after-dinner session.²⁹ In Mark's description of the Last Supper the meal is followed by a session in which hymns are sung (14,22–26a). In Luke's story of the celebration of the Lord's Supper by Paul and the Christian community at Troas the meal is followed by a session with a long conversation (Acts 20,7–11). It is true that Mark and Luke (and other New Testament authors) do not explicitly refer to dancing in the Christian assembly, but they seem to have been familiar with the phenomenon in similar bipartite gatherings.

Another Christian parallel is found in the *Acts of John* (94–97).³⁰ Here it is narrated how Jesus sings a hymn to the Father to which his disciples respond with "amen" while they are dancing around him in a circle, holding each other's hands (94). There are several agreements with *Sim.* 9,11. First there is the (implied) twofold pattern. In the *Acts of John* meal terminology is used (φαγεῖν, βρωθῆναι, 95) and the meeting, which is described as a gathering of Jesus and his disciples ("he gathered all of us together", συναγαγὼν πάντας ἡμᾶς, 94), involves singing and dancing. Moreover, the terminology is quite similar,

als Zeugnis für den gottesdienstlichen Tanz im Christentum verstehen". Klinghardt's suggestion is worth consideration.

27 See T. BERGER, *Liturgie und Tanz. Anthropologische Aspekte, historische Daten, theologische Perspektiven*, St. Ottilien, EOS, 1985, p. 22: "Tanz ist dort (natürlich) kein Thema".

28 See DE JONGE, *Early History*, p. 217 n. 15.

29 *Ibid.*, pp. 223–224.

30 For the dancing in *Act. Joh.*, see, e.g., W.C. VAN UNNIK, *A Note on the Dance of Jesus in the Acts of John*, in ID., *Sparsa Collecta*. III (NT.S, 31), Leiden, Brill, 1983, pp. 144–147; A.J. DEWEY, *The Hymn in the Acts of John: Dance as Hermeneutics*, in *Semeia* 38 (1986) 67–80; J. AUF DER MAUER, *Die Gnade tanzt. Das Tanzritual der apokryphen Johannesakten und seine Bedeutung*, in E. GÖSSMANN – G. ZOBEL (eds.), *Das Gold im Wachs. Fs für Thomas Immoos zum 70. Geburtstag*, München, Iudicium, 1988, pp. 108–145; and B.E. BOWE, *Dancing into the Divine: The Hymn of the Dance in the Acts of John*, in *J ECS* 7 (1999) 83–104.

especially the terms for “dancing” in a “circle” and “keeping silent”.³¹ Finally, “grace”, one of the virtues, is said to “dance” (ἡ χάρις χορεύει, 95). In *Hermas* the dancing virgins are later identified as virtues (*Sim.* 9,15,1–2).³² These similarities indicate that both writings describe a similar phenomenon.³³ The two passages may reflect Christian liturgical practice.³⁴

2.3 Pagan Parallels

In pagan literature there are several examples of dances performed in the context of banquets and symposia.³⁵ For instance, Longus describes how Dahpnis and Chloe partake in a banquet and symposium where people dance (and sing).³⁶ Another example is found in Petronius' *Cena Trimalchionis*, where one Fortuna begins to feel like dancing.³⁷ Finally, Petronius narrates how one Encolpius prays on his knees at the treshold of the temple to the deity Priapus.

31 Compare, resp., *Act. Joh.* (ed. JUNOD – KAESTLI) 95 (χορεύει, χορευεῖν, χορεύων), 96 (τῇ χορείᾳ) and 97 (χορεύσας) with *Sim.* 9,11,5 (ἐχόρευον); 95 (ὀρχήσαθε) with *id.* (ὠρχοῦντο); 94 (κυκλεῖοντες) with *id.* (κύκλω); and 96 (στῆτα) with *id.* (στῆγῃ).

32 See also KLINGHARDT, *Tanz*, p. 31 n. 85 (with refs.). See, e.g., Seneca, *Ben.* 1,3,2–5 (ed. BASORE), where three graces (*Gratiae*, v. 2) form a dancing choir.

33 C. ANDRESEN, *Altchristliche Kritik am Tanz—ein Ausschnitt aus dem Kampf der alten Kirche gegen heidnische Sitte*, in H. FROHNES – U.W. KNORR (eds.), *Kirchengeschichte als Missionsgeschichte. 1. Die alte Kirche*, München, Kaiser, 1974, pp. 344–376, p. 385, concludes that the dancing in *Act. Joh.* has its parallel in ancient mystery dances. This conclusion, however, may well be based on the presumption that dancing was not part of the Christian liturgy, but a pagan practice.

34 For *Act. Joh.*, see esp. KLINGHARDT, *Tanz*, p. 19: “... wahrscheinlich, dass sich hier tatsächlich liturgische Praxis spiegelt”. Pace, e.g., F.J. DÖLGER, *Klingeln, Tanz und Händeklatschen im Gottesdienst der christlichen Melitaner in Ägypten*, in *AC* 4 (1934) 245–265, p. 253: “Einen wirklichen Reigentanz in einem christlichen Kulte setzen die Johannesakten voraus... Das ist ganz im Geiste der hellenistischen Gnosis... hier [kommen] hellenistische Vorstellungen zur Geltung... Für einen Tanz als Kultbrauch des kirchlichen Christentums lässt sich also... nichts herausholen” (italics mine); and K. GROSS, *Menschenhand und Gotteshand in Antike und Christentum*, Stuttgart, Hiersemann, 1985, p. 70: “Die gnostischen Akten des Johannes berichten von einem sakralen Tanz Jesu mit seinen Jüngern vor seinem Leiden”; and p. 71: “Von diesem Bericht her darf auf einen liturgischen Brauch einer gnostischen Gemeinde geschlossen werden”.

35 See esp. DE JONGE, *Early History*, pp. 216 n. 14, 217 n. 15; and ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, pp. 211–212 with n. 3.

36 See Longus, *Daphn.* 2,31,2–3 (ed. HENDERSON): ἡσάν τινας καὶ ᾠδὰς... ἦσεν; and 4,38,3: “partygoers” (συμπόταις): ἦδεν... ὠρχήσαντο.

37 See Petronius, *Cena Trimalchionis* 70,10 (ed. SMITH): iam coeperat Fortuna velle saltare.

One of the things he says is that “drunken youth shall dance (step exulted) three times around your shrine”.³⁸

What precedes shows that the dancing in *Hermas* cannot be traced to a specifically Jewish, Christian or Greco-Roman background. Dancing at banquets and symposia was a widespread phenomenon throughout the ancient world. *Hermas* is a witness to this practice.

3 Meaning

It remains to be seen what the meaning and function of the dancing in *Hermas* are. The dancing has been interpreted in various ways. It has been explained as part of the “game of love”, meant to describe the syzygy between *Hermas* and the virtues;³⁹ as an image of the stabilization of *Hermas*’ virtuous life;⁴⁰ as a “mystical experience”;⁴¹ as part of “a background scene in the bucolic

38 See Petronius, *Sat.* 133 (ed. MÜLLER): *positoque in limine genu sic deprecatus sum numen aversum: . . . et ter ovantem circa delubrum gressum feret ebria pubes.*

39 See DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 617 (“Minnespiel”); and p. 619: “So scheint der Verf. [Verfasser] also eine erotische Darstellung zu benutzen, um die Syzygie zwischen *Hermas* und den Tugenden zu beschreiben”.

40 See BROX, *Hirt*, p. 410: “die erotisch ausgemalte Zuneigung der Jungfrauen zu H[ermas] . . . [hat] den Sinn, das Nahverhältnis der Tugenden zu H[ermas] zu schildern. . . [Es ist] ein Bild für die Stabilisierung seines tugendhaften Lebens”.

41 See KLINGHARDT, *Tanz*, p. 24: “Die erotischen Aspekte haben daher die Funktion, die Intensität der Inspirationserfahrung, die eine gleichsam körperliche Dimension besitzt, zum Ausdruck zu bringen”; p. 25: “die mystische Erfahrung des *Hermas* mit den Jungfrauen”; and p. 30: “der Tanz [bringt] nicht in erster Linie religiöse Gefühle oder religiöses Bewusstsein zum Ausdruck . . . sondern . . . er [vermittelt] diese religiöse Erfahrung in besonderer Weise . . . und [bewirkt] Inspiration und Offenbarung”. Klinghardt does not specify what he exactly means by “mystical”, but it seems that it is meant in the sense of “spiritual” or “inspirational”. He takes the dancing in *Hermas* as an example of an experience of collective inspiration. This may be true for the Therapeutae, who perform their dance/song in an “inspired” and “enthusiastic” way (84, 89), as well as for Jesus and his disciples in *Act. Joh.*, whose dancing is a noetic experience that leads to deeper insight: “those who do not dance, do not know what will happen” (95). But *Hermas* does not so much describe a mystical experience of inspiration as an experience of personal change. It is true that after the scene with *Hermas* and the virgins the Shepherd explains to *Hermas* the meaning of his visionary experiences (*Sim.* 9,11,9 and onwards), but there is no direct link with the previous dancing.

genre";⁴² as a reminiscence of Gnostic dances,⁴³ etc.⁴⁴ But another interpretation may be more plausible. The dancing incorporates the figure Hermas into a group of women. By means of this experience, he overcomes his erotic feelings. It is the decisive stage in his process of change with regard to his sexual feelings for women.⁴⁵ Broadly speaking, this process consisted of three stages. First, Hermas became aware of the sinfulness of his sexual desires for Rhoda.⁴⁶ Second, his relationship with his wife became asexual.⁴⁷ Finally, he realized that being close to women (by kissing, embracing, dancing, etc.) is not (and

42 See R.A. SKERIS, *Musical Imagery in the Ecclesiastical Writers of the First Three Centuries* (PhD thesis, University of Bonn, 1976), p. 24: "The description of the maidens dancing and singing to pass the time, in *Sim.* 9,11,5 is simply a background scene in the bucolic genre".

43 See GROSS, *Menschenhand*, p. 71: "Ebenso [i.e., as in *Act. Joh.*] kann in der seltsamen Szene des 'Pastor Hermae' [*Sim.* 9,11,5], in der Jungfrauen, wohl allegorische Gestalten, die mit Hermas rings um den Turm laufen, im Reigen schreiten und tanzen, eine Erinnerung an Tänze der Gnostiker vorliegen".

44 Other commentators leave the meaning of the dance out of consideration. See, e.g., LUSCHNAT, *Jungfrauenszene*, p. 53: "was inhaltlich mit der Geschichte gemeint ist, bleibt dunkel". On pp. 54–56 he interprets the dancing from pagan literature and religion. He refers to parallels of rejuvenation through dance (Euripides, *Bacch.* 188–190; Aristophanes, *Ran.* 345; and *Pax* 860–862). Hermas feels indeed rejuvenated (9,11,5), but the rejuvenation is not so much related to the dancing as to Hermas' personal change (see also OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 229; pace KLINGHARDT, *Tanz*, p. 24 n. 59; cf. WHITE, *Interaction*, pp. 147–148, who argues that Hermas' rejuvenation means his return to the stage before the awakening of sexuality). LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 488 n. 322, cites several pagan, Jewish and Christian parallels of dances, but does not comment on the function or meaning (see esp. p. 487 n. 302, where he concludes that the exact function of the *circumambulatio* is not clear). OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 229, comments: "The playfulness in which Hermas begins to engage with the young women is a childlike innocence of enjoyment. . . . The young women seem to be having a great late afternoon party around the tower, in which Hermas enters fully. . . . His rejuvenation, an image of conversion, mirrors that of the woman church in the third *Vision* [*Vis.* 3,11–13], which was also the result of the conversion of members of the church". Unfortunately, her interpretation does not really go into the meaning and function of the dancing.

45 It should be noted that Hermas' sexual feelings are not the only things that need to change: he needs to re-establish his authority over his household (see esp. *Vis.* 1,3,1) and to make sure that the members of his house (or house church) will all be changed (see esp. *Sim.* 10,2,2 and 10,3,2).

46 See *Vis.* 1,1,2,5,8 and 1,2,1,3–4.

47 See *Vis.* 2,2,3.

should not be) an erotic experience.⁴⁸ His encounter with the virgins signifies an important element of his personal change: overcoming sexuality in order to become a better Christian.

Concluding Remarks

The dancing of Hermas and the virgins in *Sim.* 9,11,4–5 signifies the personal change of the figure Hermas from a man with sexual feelings for other women than his own wife (Rhoda, *Vis.* 1,1–1,2) to a man who even when he is surrounded by virgins who embrace and kiss him does not have any erotic feelings (*Sim.* 9,11). The setting of the dancing alludes to the Christian assembly: the dancing takes place around and near the tower (9,11,4–6), which represents the church (9,13,1), and the gathering reflects the twofold pattern of the gatherings of the early Christians, consisting of a meal (see ἐδείπνησα[ς] in 9,11,8) and an after-dinner session (see the prayer in 9,11,7). Dancing at banquets and symposia was customary throughout the ancient world, as examples in Jewish, Christian and pagan literature show. *Hermas* seems to reflect an early Christian practice of dancing in the gatherings of the Christian community.

48 See *Sim.* 9,11. KLINGHARDT, *Tanz*, p. 24, interprets the dancing in the Archilochos inscription in a similar way: “Archilochos verliert das Bewusstsein vor lauter Freude in dem Moment, in dem der Tanz mit den jungen Frauen ihm *körperlich nahe* kommt, erkennt aber erst im Nachhinein, das *dieser Tanz kein erotisches Erlebnis war*” (italics mine). Klinghardt does, however, not note that Hermas’ experience is quite similar: by dancing with the virgins, he experiences physical closeness to the women, yet realizes that it is not an erotic experience.

The “Holy Kiss”

Greeting one’s fellow-Christians with a kiss is an ancient practice.¹ In the literature on the “holy kiss” (φίλημα ἅγιον) in early Christianity it has been argued that “after the New Testament writings the liturgical kiss is not mentioned in the early church for almost a hundred years” and that “Justin Martyr is the first Christian writer to refer to it again in the middle of the second century”.² In *Hermas* kissing occurs in *Sim.* 9,6,2 and in 9,11,4. The question that will be addressed is whether or not this kissing refers to the “holy kiss”.

1 A Welcoming Kiss of Honour

In *Sim.* 9,6,2 the virgins who protect the tower welcome a man, who later turns out to be the lord and inspector of the tower and the Son of God, with a kiss.³ They run towards him, kiss (κατεφίλησαν) him and follow him closely when he walks around the tower for inspection. On the surface of the story, the kiss functions as a greeting, the common function of a kiss in secular usage.⁴

1 See also M.P. PENN, *Kissing Christians: Ritual and Community in the Late Ancient Church* (Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion), Philadelphia, PA, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005, p. 19. See already 1 Thess 5,26; 1 Cor 16,20; 2 Cor 13,12; and Rom 16,16. For the idea that Paul encourages the holy kiss, see W. KLASSEN, *The Sacred Kiss in the New Testament: An Example of Social Boundary Lines*, in *NTS* 39 (1993) 122–135, pp. 130–132; and ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, p. 256. For an anthropological study of the kiss, see, e.g., W. FRIJHOFF, *The Kiss Sacred and Profane: Reflections on a Cross-Cultural Confrontation*, in J. BREMMER – H. ROODENBURG (eds.), *A Cultural History of Gesture: From Antiquity to the Present Day*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1991, pp. 210–236 (no ref. to *Hermas*); and G.S. ALDRETE, *Gestures and Acclamations in Ancient Rome* (Ancient Society and History), Baltimore, MD – London, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999 (no ref. to *Hermas*).

2 See S. BENKO, *Pagan Rome and the Early Christians*, Bloomington, IN, Indiana University Press, 1984, p. 81. See also PENN, *Kissing Christians*, p. 21 with n. 80; and ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, p. 257.

3 For the identification of the lord and inspector of the tower with the Son of God, see *Sim.* 9,12,8 (cf. 9,5,2,6; 9,6; and 9,7,1).

4 See also, e.g., LUSCHNAT, *Jungfrauenszene*, p. 63: “Es handelt sich um Begrüßung”. Pace DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 611: “Daß die Jungfrauen den Herrn küssen, ist nicht etwa als Ausdruck herkömmlicher Sitte . . . zu betrachten, fällt vielmehr in einem urchristlichen Text als fremdartig auf . . .”. A variety of Greco-Roman, Jewish and Christian texts refer to the kiss as a form

On the background of the story lies another meaning of the kiss. It is part of a number of details which are meant to emphasize the status or authority of the man. His importance and dignity are emphasized by the fact that “a procession of many men” (παράταξις πολλῶν ἀνδρῶν) comes to him, that his height exceeds that of the tower (v. 1), that the six main builders of the tower accompany him, that all the builders are there and “many other honourable people (ἐνδοξοί)” surround him.⁵ The fact that the virgins welcome him with a kiss is to be seen within this context.

Being welcomed by a multitude of people stresses one’s importance. A similar motif is found in, for example, Mark 9,15, where a crowd (ὄχλος) comes to Jesus and greets him. Compare the story of Jesus’ entry in Jerusalem in Mark 11,8 (πολλοί), Matt 21,8 (ὁ δὲ πλείστος ὄχλος) and Luke 19,37 (ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος). Further, the description of the man as being taller than the tower is similar to, for instance, *Gospel of Peter* 40, where Christ is very tall.⁶ In ancient texts a tall man is a man of stature.⁷ Superhuman size sometimes indicates royal

of greeting. See, e.g. Martial, *Epigr.* 2,59 (ed. SHACKLETON BAILEY); Josephus, *Ant.* 7,284 (ed. NODET); 8,387; Matt 26,49; Mark 14,45; Luke 7,45; 15,20; 22,47–48; Rom 16,16; 1 Cor 16,20; 2 Cor 13,12; 1 Thess 5,26 (φιλημα ἄγιον); 1 Pet 5,14 (φιλημα ἀγάπης); *Jos. Asen.* 4,1.5 (κατεφίλησεν, ed. BURCHARD); and *Act. Joh.* 62 (κατεφίλου, ed. JUNOD – KAESTLI). In some of these texts the kiss may refer to the holy kiss: what matters here is that its basic function is that of a greeting. See also, e.g., KLASSEN, *Sacred Kiss*, p. 130; and PENN, *Kissing Christians*, p. 59 with n. 5. A welcoming kiss was a widespread Hellenistic custom.

- 5 See *Sim.* 9,6,1–2. See also BROX, *Hirt*, p. 398; and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 223. See further LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 486 n. 300, who argues that Hermas sketches an “Adventus-Szene”, alluding to imperial ceremonies and to stories in literary sources of gods and goddesses.
- 6 For this motif, see, e.g., *Gos. Pet.* 40 (ed. KRAUS – NICKLAS); and *Act. Joh.* 89 (ed. JUNOD – KAESTLI). P. FOSTER, *The Gospel of Peter: Introduction, Critical Edition and Commentary* (TENT, 4), Leiden, Brill, 2010, p. 421, argues that Christ’s height (in *Gos. Pet.* 10,40b) denotes not only authority, but also “the ability to communicate both with, or move between, the heavenly and earthly realms”.
- 7 Cf. *Sim.* 9,3,1. An interesting example (although it does not concern a man, but a goddess) is found in *Homeric Hymns* 2,187–190 (ed. WEST). Demeter enters the house of Keleos. Her head is said to reach to the rafter (μέλαθρον) of the house. When she enters, she is welcomed with awe (αἰδώς) and reverence (σέβας). Interestingly, her height is, as in *Hermas*, compared to that of a building.

In ancient literature tall figures appear frequently in dreams and visions. See, e.g., Hipparchus’ dream of a “tall and beautiful man” (ἄνδρα . . . μέγαν καὶ εὐειδέα) in Herodotus, *Hist.* 5,56 (ed. GODLEY); Xerxes’ vision of a “tall and beautiful man” (ἄνδρα . . . μέγαν τε καὶ εὐειδέα) in 7,12; Cyrus’ dream of a figure of “more than human majesty” in Xenophon, *Cyr.* 8,7,2 (ed. MILLER); Curtius Rufus’ vision of “a woman of superhuman stature and beauty” (*offertur ei mulieris figura humana grandior pulchriorque*) in Pliny, *Ep.* 7,27,2 (ed. RADICE)

power.⁸ Finally, the greeting and honouring of the man with a kiss resembles that of the salutation of the emperor as described in various ancient writings.⁹ In *Sim.* 9,6,2 the kiss is one of the marks of honour.

This kiss does not seem to allude to the holy kiss. Unlike the "ritual" kiss, the kissing here is not meant to transcend divisions among the people involved.¹⁰ It rather emphasizes the authority and status of the lord of the tower over against those who are involved in the building process. In the Greco-Roman world kissing was closely connected with status: "it both illustrated and produced distinctions".¹¹ It was a gesture of respect or submission.¹² At this point, it is interesting that the text seems to imply that the virgins are standing when they kiss the lord. A kiss of honour was usually combined with kneeling. Honouring the emperor with a kiss was often preceded by prostration.¹³

and cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 11,21 (ed. JACKSON); King Ptolemy's dream of a "young man of extraordinary beauty and superhuman stature" (*oblatus per quietem decore eximio et maiore quam humana specie iuvenem*) in Tacitus, *Hist.* 4,83 (ed. MOORE); and Daphnis' dream of three tall and beautiful nymphs in Longus, *Daphn.* 2,23,1 (ed. HENDERSON).

- 8 See, e.g., Herodotus, *Hist.* 3,30 (ed. GODLEY), where an angel reveals to Cambyses in a dream (ὅψιν εἶδε... ἐν ὕπνῳ) that his brother Smerdis sits on the royal throne with his head reaching to heaven (ὥς ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ τῷ βασιλῆϊ ἰζόμενος Σμέρδης τῇ κεφαλῇ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ψάύσειε). As a result, Cambyses sends someone to kill his brother, because he is afraid that his brother will become king.
- 9 See also LEUTZSCH, *Hirt*, p. 487 n. 301: "Der Kuß als Ehrenbezeugung hat im monarchischen Zeremoniell des Prinzipats seinen Ort". See, e.g., Seneca, *Ben.* 2,12 (ed. BASORE), on Caesar asking senator Pompeius Pennus to kiss his left foot; Phaedrus 5,1,5 (ed. PERRY), on the foremost citizens (*principes*) kissing the hand of king Demetrius; Tacitus, *Ann.* 15,71 (ed. JACKSON), on people prostrating themselves at the knees of Nero and kissing his hand; *Hist.* 1,45 (ed. MOORE), on people kissing the hand of Otho; Pliny, *Pan.* 24,2 (ed. RADICE), on Trajan who, according to Pliny, did not, unlike other emperors, ask his subjects to humiliate themselves at his feet and did not return a kiss with no more than a stretched out hand; and Suetonius, *Cal.* 56,2 (ed. ROLFE); *Otho* 6,2 (ed. ROLFE). For literature on the kiss as salutation of the emperor, see, e.g., R. BRILLIANT, *Gesture and Rank in Roman Art: The Use of Gestures to Denote Status in Roman Sculpture and Coinage* (MCAA, 14), New Haven, CT, Academy of Arts & Sciences, 1963; SITTLE, *Gebärden*, pp. 79–80, 166–170; A. ALFÖLDI, *Die monarchische Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreiche*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980³, esp. pp. 40–42, 62–64; and PENN, *Kissing Christians*, p. 14 with n. 34.
- 10 For this function of the holy kiss, see, e.g., BENKO, *Pagan Rome*, p. 91; PENN, *Kissing Christians*, p. 33: "the [Christian] ritual kiss temporarily erased status distinctions"; and ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, p. 256.
- 11 See PENN, *Kissing Christians*, p. 15.
- 12 *Ibid.*, pp. 14, 81.
- 13 See, e.g., Seneca, *Ben.* 2,12,2 (ed. BASORE); and Suetonius, *Nero* 13,2 (ed. ROLFE).

Another act which involved kissing and kneeling was the kissing of one's feet. In Luke 7,38.45 the kissing of the feet (κατεφίλει τοὺς πόδας . . . καταφιλοῦσά μου τοὺς πόδας), which implies kneeling down and kissing, is portrayed as more honourable than kissing alone. As such, the kiss in *Hermas* is not the highest form of reverence. A feasible explanation for this may be that, on the level of the narrative, the women who kiss the lord of the tower are involved in the building process and, thus, have a higher status than those who are merely part of the building, that is, the believers. In *Sim.* 9,6,2 the kiss functions first and foremost as a greeting showing reverence.

2 A Kiss with Ritual Connotations

In *Sim.* 9,11,4 the kiss (καταφιλεῖν) given to Hermas by the virgins has another meaning and function.¹⁴ Within the context of *Sim.* 9,10,4b–11,8 it is not a welcoming kiss, but marks the beginning of an evening with symbolic and ritual overtones.

The kiss is not a greeting. It takes place somewhere in the middle of the passage. By that time, Hermas and the virgins have already met. In *Sim.* 9,10,6–7a the Shepherd leaves Hermas alone with the virgins. An issue is made of the fact that a man is left alone in the company of women. The virgins explain to Hermas that he will stay with them until the Shepherd comes back (11,1). Hermas replies that he will wait for the Shepherd until the evening, but, if the man does not come, will go home and return the next morning (v. 2). The women answer him that he cannot go away (v. 2) and add: “You will sleep with us like a brother and not as a husband, because you are our brother”. Hermas feels ashamed to remain with them (v. 3). Then suddenly one of the virgins begins to “kiss” (καταφιλεῖν) and “embrace” (περιπλέκεσθαι) him and the others follow her example and kiss him, lead him around the tower and play with him (v. 4). The kiss is not a greeting: it takes place some time after they have met.

The author plays with erotic and non-erotic connotations of a kiss. It is striking that the women take the initiative to kiss.¹⁵ In the New Testament, for instance, there is only one case in which a woman begins to kiss a man, namely Luke 7,38.45, where the woman kisses (κατεφίλει; φίλημά . . . καταφιλοῦσά) Jesus' feet. It has been suggested that an erotic element is present in this

14 Pace LUSCHNAT, *Jungfrauenszene*, p. 63, who explains the kissing and embracing in *Sim.* 9,11,4 as an elaboration of that in *Sim.* 9,6,2.

15 OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 223, points at the fact that it is unusual that women give the kiss, but she does not give a possible explanation for this “unusual feature”.

story.¹⁶ It is not described where the virgins kiss Hermas: this is left open. Kissing and embracing are, of course, not necessarily erotic. A good example is Luke 15,20, where the father greets his son by hugging and kissing him (ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν). Another example is found in *Joseph and Aseneth* 22,9, where Jacob welcomes Joseph and Aseneth with a kiss (κατεφίλησεν) and Aseneth, in her turn, greets Jacob by embracing and kissing (κατεφίλησεν) him. Yet, in other parts of the same love story, kissing and embracing do have erotic connotations. In 19,10–11, for example, Joseph and Aseneth kiss (κατεφίλησεν) and embrace each other thrice for a long time.¹⁷ Hermas plays on these ambivalent connotations.

In *Sim.* 9,11 various terms with erotic overtones are used in a non-erotic way. For instance, spending the night (νύξ) sleeping (κοιμάω) with women (vv. 3, 6–7) connotes sexual intercourse.¹⁸ Loving (ἀγαπάω, v. 3) sometimes refers to sexual love.¹⁹ Shaming (αἰσχύνω, v. 3) as well as doing harm (ὑβρίν ποιέω, v. 8) can mean sexual dishonour or rape.²⁰ Playing (παίζων, vv. 4–5) sometimes

16 See KLASSEN, *Sacred Kiss*, p. 129. See also the chapter "The Kiss" in BENKO, *Pagan Rome*, pp. 79–102, p. 98, where it is argued (against the idea that the holy kiss in the New Testament does not have any erotic connotations) that the kiss, as sign of love and union, is a religious, ritual act which connotes sexual love (because it makes use of the imagery of marital relationships and sexual symbolism).

17 See *Jos. Asen.* 19,10–11 (ed. BURCHARD).

18 See, e.g., Herodotus, *Hist.* 3,68 (ed. GODLEY), where Otanes informs with which men his daughter Phaedyne has had sexual intercourse (παρ' ὅτεω ἀνθρώπων κοιμῶτο); and an inscription from Cyrene (ed. VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF, p. 157): "a man who comes from a woman with whom he has slept at night, may offer what he wants" ([ἀπ']ὸ γυναικὸς ἀνὴρ τὰν νύκτα κοιμαθὲς θύσει ὃ[τι] [χα] δήληται), but if during the day, he should wash himself first.

19 See Lucian, *Jup.* 2 (ed. MACLEOD), where Hera reprimands Zeus for his sexual affairs, with which he has affronted her many times, by saying: "It is likely that you have found another Danae or Semele or Europa . . . to fall down through the roof into the lap of your lover (εἰς τὸν κόλπον τῆς ἀγαπωμένης)".

20 See esp. Isocrates, *Paneg.* 4,114 (ed. NORLIN): "(their) rape of children and their sexual dishonouring of women" (παίδων ὑβρεις καὶ γυναικῶν αἰσχύνας). For αἰσχύνω in the sense of "dishonouring", see also, e.g., Euripides, *El.* 44 (ed. KOVACS): "this man (the farmer) has never dishonoured her (Electra) in bed, she is still a virgin" (ἦν οὐποθ' ἀνὴρ ὅδε . . . ἥσχυν' ἐν εὐνῇ, παρθένος δ' ἔτ' ἐστὶ δῆ). For ὑβρίν ποιέω in the sense of dishonouring one's body in a sexual sense (by prostitution), see Aeschines, *Tim.* 188 (ed. ADAMS): τοῦ σώματος ὑβρίν πεπρακώς.

means having sex.²¹ Hermas uses these terms with erotic connotations in a non-erotic sense.

From this perspective the kissing (καταφιλεῖν, v. 4) is to be interpreted. It has been pointed out that in the Greco-Roman world non-erotic kisses between unrelated people of the opposite sex are rare:²² a man and a woman kissing each other was usually seen as an act with erotic potential.²³ In *Sim.* 9,11 the kiss is de-eroticized.²⁴ Just before the kissing takes place, it is stressed that the virgins (παρθέναι) will sleep with Hermas “as a brother, not as a husband” (ὡς ἀδελφός, καὶ οὐχ ὡς ἀνὴρ). The kiss which follows shows how love among believers is expressed in an asexual way.

The ambivalence (erotic/nonerotic) and de-eroticization of the kiss in *Hermas* resembles several early-Christian treatises on the holy kiss. A kiss expresses intimate association. Kissing can easily become an erotic experience. Early Christian authors who wrote on the ritual kiss were well aware of this. Athenagoras of Athens warns his fellow-Christians not to get tempted to kiss a second time because they enjoyed the first kiss so much.²⁵ Tertullian states that a non-Christian husband would not allow his wife to meet up with any of her Christian brethren to exchange the kiss (*ad osculum convenire*).²⁶ And the *Apostolic Constitutions* prescribe that during the Christian gathering men only kiss men and women only kiss women.²⁷ It is sometimes argued that Clement of Alexandria also warns against the abuse of the kiss by those who enjoy it, but the text is, in fact, directed against the exchange of the kiss without loving God and one's neighbour: there are those who kiss, but who do not have love

21 See esp. Gen 26,8 LXX (ed. RAHLFS): “He [Abimelech] saw Isaac playing with (παίζονται μετὰ, i.e., making love with) Rebecca, his wife”; and Xenophon, *Symp.* 9,2 (ed. MARCHANT): Ariadne and Dionysius “will amuse themselves together” (παίξονται πρὸς ἀλλήλους, i.e., make love: B. HUB, *Xenophons Symposium. Ein Kommentar* [BzA, 125], Stuttgart – Leipzig, Teubner, 1999, p. 441, does not comment on the erotic connotation of παίξονται).

22 See PENN, *Kissing Christians*, p. 36 with n. 43.

23 *Ibid.*, p. 106.

24 See also KLASSEN, *Sacred Kiss*, p. 129: “the free and uninhibited exchange of kisses with maidens as part of an evening of play which leads to sleeping together ‘as a brother, not as a husband’ with relative strangers depicted in the *Shepherd of Hermas* seeks to prove something quite different. Is it that the erotic element has been conquered as an enemy?” Klassen's question is to be answered in the affirmative.

25 See Athenagoras, *Leg.* 32,2 (ed. MARCOVICH): “Ἐάν τις διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ δευτέρου καταφιλήσῃ, ὅτι ἤρρεσεν αὐτῷ, <ἡμάρτηκεν>.”

26 See Tertullian, *Ux.* 2,4,3 (ed. MUNIER).

27 See *Const. ap.* 2,57,17 and 8,11,9 (ed. FUNK).

within themselves.²⁸ A hug also carries potential erotic connotations. For this reason, Ps. Hippolytus recommends that, when the kiss of peace is exchanged in the Christian assembly, men only embrace men and women only women: "but let not men embrace (*salutabunt*/ἀσπάζεσθαι) women".²⁹

In *Hermas* the kiss changes Hermas' attitude towards intimacy. Hermas' reticence to stay with the virgins is overcome by a kiss. Before the kiss he feels ashamed (11,3). After the kiss he feels young again (v. 5). It is the kiss which makes him realize that intimacy among Christian brothers and sisters will do no harm.³⁰ Hermas does not warn against the kiss, but shows how in a Christian context its potential erotic element is (and is to be) kept under control.³¹ Kissing is not repressed, but its meaning is transformed: it is de-eroticized.³² It is an example of Christian self-control and sexual restraint.

In *Hermas* the kiss has a symbolic and ritual function. It symbolizes Christian love and fellowship. It marks the beginning of Hermas' companionship with the virgins.³³ It is through the kiss that Hermas is taken into a newly formed Christian "family" of sisters (the virgins) and brother (Hermas, ἀδελφός, v. 3).³⁴ Moreover, the kiss signifies a ritual of inclusion. The kiss marks the beginning

28 See Clement of Alexandria, *Paed.* 3,81 (ed. MARCOVICH). Pace BENKO, *Pagan Rome*, p. 85; PENN, *Kissing Christians*, pp. 1–2, 22 (cf. 106–107, 110–113); and ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, p. 258.

29 See Ps. Hippolytus, *Trad. ap.* 18 (ed. BOTTE).

30 Pace OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 228, who argues that "Hermas' shame is the appropriate male reaction to being in a situation involving women that he cannot control. His sexual honor is at stake ...". The issue is not so much Hermas' sexual honour as his reluctance to stay overnight with women in a situation full of erotic potential. See also DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, p. 617: "Seine [i.e., Hermas'] anfängliche Weigerung, bei ihnen zu bleiben, beruht ... auf einer keuschen Scheu, die ihn abhält, eine Nacht mit Jungfrauen zu verbringen ..."; and BROX, *Hirt*, p. 410 ("[mit] der keuschen Scham").

31 Pace OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 229, who contends that the erotic potential of the kissing and embracing in v. 4 may be apparent to the modern reader, but not necessarily to the ancient reader. She points at *Sim.* 9,6,2, where "eroticism is not suggested". But v. 4 is to be seen in light of the whole context, which is replete of erotic overtones.

32 According to PENN, *Kissing Christians*, p. 13, de-eroticizing the kiss was a general tendency in early Christian writings. But Penn does not refer to *Hermas* here.

33 Cf. *Jos. Asen.* 8,4–7 (ed. BURCHARD, pp. 114 and 116). When Aseneth is asked to greet Joseph with a kiss (καταφιλήσων), Joseph stops her and explains to her that a godfearing man should not kiss another woman than his own (φιλήσαι γυναῖκα ἀλλοτρίαν, v. 5), or vice versa (φιλήσαι ἄνδρα ἀλλότριον, v. 7). Here kissing is seen as an act which establishes fellowship between people.

34 Cf. the general remark in PENN, *Kissing Christians*, p. 31: "With the kiss's assistance, Christian communities became families united by faith". See also pp. 26–53 (Ch. 2, "The

of a gathering which takes place in the context of the church (the tower)³⁵ and includes dancing, singing (v. 5) and praying (v. 7) which is interpreted as a symbolic δεῖπνον (v. 8). These elements reflect rituals which were part of early Christian gatherings.³⁶ It is, therefore, reasonable to assume that the kisses which are exchanged between Hermas and the virgins allude to the holy kiss.

It may go too far to conclude that the kissing equals the holy kiss. In contemporary early Christian writings the ritual kiss is usually mentioned in direct relation to the Eucharist. Justin Martyr, for example, writes that the kiss occurs after prayer and before the consecration and distribution of the bread and the cup of wine of the Eucharist.³⁷ More generally, it was customary to welcome guests at banquets with a kiss. Luke, for instance, refers to this practice when he writes that Jesus reprimanded his host Simon for the fact that he did not give him a kiss when he came to his house for a meal.³⁸ In *Sim.* 9,11 the kiss is not directly related to a meal situation (though a symbolic meal is referred to). Nevertheless, the kiss functions as a symbolic and ritual act within the context of a gathering which alludes to the Christian assembly. With the kiss, Hermas hints at the holy kiss.

Kiss that Binds: Christian Communities and Group Cohesion”), where Penn argues that a kiss joins individuals together into a united social body.

35 Cf. DIBELIUS, *Hirt*, pp. 616–619 (“Minnespiel”); BROX, *Hirt*, pp. 405–412 (“Spiel”); and OSIEK, *Shepherd*, p. 229 (“a great late afternoon party around the tower”), who do not note this. L.E. PHILLIPS, *The Ritual Kiss in Early Christian Worship* (JLS, 36), Cambridge, Grove Books, 1996, p. 134, suggests that “the whole passage in Hermas [*Sim.* 9,11] is baptismal in character and may allude to a ‘rite’ of Christian initiation that includes the use of a baptismal garment and a baptismal kiss”. PENN, *Kissing Christians*, pp. 138–139, rightly rejects this view. Indeed, the passage does not allude to water or any other baptismal element. But Penn’s statement that the kissing “is not explicitly connected with any early Christian ritual” goes too far. As a matter of fact, the kissing, dancing, singing, praying, etc., take place nearby the tower that represents the church.

36 See, e.g., ALIKIN, *Earliest History*, pp. 211–227 (singing), 228–253 (prayer) and 103–146 (the Lord’s Supper).

37 See Justin Martyr, *1 Apol.* 65,2 (ed. MINNS – PARVIS). The comment of PENN, *Kissing Christians*, p. 23, that “Origen is . . . the first writer directly to link the ritual kiss with the Eucharist”, is puzzling, because already in Justin Martyr the kiss precedes the Eucharist. Penn’s argument that “Justin stresses the kiss’s connection only with prayer despite its temporal proximity to the Eucharist” (p. 22) is unconvincing. See also pp. 44–45 with n. 79.

38 See Luke 7,45.

Concluding Remarks

Hermas alludes to the holy kiss in *Sim.* 9,11,4. It shows that even though Justin Martyr is the first Christian author after the period in which the writings later collected in the New Testament originated who explicitly refers to the ritual kiss, it is not true that earlier or contemporary authors do not refer to it at all. In *Hermas* the kiss is a symbolic act within the context of a gathering which alludes to the Christian assembly. It initiates Hermas' companionship with the virgins. It marks the beginning of Hermas' awareness and experience of the meaning of intimacy among Christian brothers and sisters in an asexual way. As such, it is part of Hermas' wider view on "spiritual marriage". Hermas does neither encourage (like Paul) nor discourage (like Athenagoras, Tertullian, and the *Apostolic Constitution*) kissing among believers, but uses the kiss, which connotes sexual love, as a manifestation of asexual love. Believers are to go beyond the erotic. Sexual symbolism is used in the service of a call for asexual relationships. The kiss is another and, for now, final example of Hermas' attempts to build up a community of renewed believers.

General Conclusions

The *Shepherd of Hermas* is one of the key texts for studying the development of community building in the early church. Eleven aspects have been studied.

First there are four aspects of identity: the relation to Judaism (*Vorlage*), the views on the resurrection (“theology”), the stance on outsiders (“the others”) and the position on the authorities (“friend”, “enemy”?). A first conclusion is that there is no basis for designating *Hermas* or the addressed community as “Jewish Christian”. The author does not hint at any Jewish-Christian controversies. Moreover, Kashrut, Sabbath observance and circumcision are not addressed: Christians have their own law (*Sim.* 1,5–7). Finally, it is not the biblical or Jewish roots of the church that are emphasized, but the fact that the church goes its own way (*Sim.* 9,17,1–2).

Hermas does not portray Jesus as the risen-one, but as the one who was adopted and exalted by God, which was no vindication of him who suffered and died, but a reward for him who faithfully served God beyond normal expectations (*Sim.* 5,6,5–7). For believers, Hermas does not envision a resurrection, an angelic transformation, or an ascension of the soul to heaven, but (just) a continued existence (*Sim.* 5,6–7). It remains unknown whether Hermas’ ideas were somehow shared by his addressees, but apparently the work was written in a context in which these views could be expressed.

Hermas shows “sectarian” tendencies. The community is thought of as exclusive and elect (*Vis.* 1,3,4). Community members are set against “outsiders” (ἑθνη) who will not be saved (esp. *Vis.* 3,6,1). Hermas expects believers to distance themselves from the ways of the world (*Vis.* 1,1,8; 4,3,4; *Man.* 4,1,9; 10,1,4; 11,2,4; and *Sim.* 5,3,6) and to be fully committed to the community (*Vis.* 3,6,2 and *Sim.* 8,9,1,3). The community is seen as a *corpus mixtum* which on its way to perfection incorporates both true and untrue believers (*Sim.* 3,2–3; 9,6,4–5; 9,9,6–7; 9,10,4; and 9,18,2–4). Hermas seeks the purification of the church by the conversion of its members (esp. *Vis.* 3 and *Sim.* 9). Breaking off of fellowship with as well as excluding deviant members is envisioned (see *Man.* 4,1,9, resp. *Vis.* 3,5,5; *Sim.* 9,13,9; and 9,14,2). Nonetheless, the emphasis is not on exclusion, but on reconciliation (*Man.* 4,1,8 and 8,10). Mission among outsiders is envisioned (*Vis.* 3,5,4; 3,7,3; *Sim.* 8,3,2; and 9,17,1–4) and community members are allowed to have socio-economical relationships with outsiders (cf. *Sim.* 1,9). Being active in the world for the sake of mission or for socio-economic reasons is, however, no indication of a lesser degree of sectarianism.

Hermas' attitude towards the authorities is not so much characterized by hostility as by indifference: believers should avoid confrontations (*Sim.* 1,4–6). For Hermas, who belongs to a small Christian minority and to the lower social classes of society, any revolutionary ideas are out of the question. Hermas does not explicitly argue against the emperor cult, but the idea that God is the Almighty (*Vis.* 3,3,5; *Sim.* 5,7,3; and 9,23,4), the expectation of the end of the present order (*Vis.* 1,3,4), and the use of apotheosis terminology for (deceased) believers (*Vis.* 1,1,4–5) all challenge the idea that the emperor should be venerated. Hermas' critique on the veneration of the emperor does not seem to aim at believers who are actually participating in the cult. It is stressed that believers should not be involved in it. As such, the critique is meant to affirm and strengthen the identity of the addressed community.

Second there are two social aspects: the role of women and "charity". In *Hermas* figures like Rhoda and Grapte exemplify women with a prominent role in society respectively in the Christian community (*Vis.* 1,1,1 and *Vis.* 2,4,3). Women are, however, not encouraged to raise their voice (*Vis.* 2,2,3). Moreover, a household with a *paterfamilias* and a church with male leaders is assumed to be the "normal" setting (*Sim.* 7,3; resp. *Vis.* 2,2,6 and 2,4,3).

Hermas does not describe charity as social help out of altruism, compassion, or sympathy, but as a pious duty (*Man.* 2,4 and *Sim.* 1,9) in the self-interest of the giver (*Vis.* 3,6,6; 3,9,5; *Sim.* 1,11; 2,5–10; 5,2,10; 5,3,7; 9,20,3; 9,31,2; and 10,4,2–4); it may bring the giver closer to God (*Man.* 2,6; *Sim.* 5,3,8–9; and 9,30,5).

Third there are five ritual aspects: baptism and μετάνοια, community meals, the Sunday collection, dancing (and singing) and the holy kiss. Baptism by immersion of new believers as a sign of their conversion is assumed to be the usual initiation rite (*Vis.* 3,2,9; *Man.* 4,3,1; and *Sim.* 9,16,2.4.6). Hermas' focus is not on baptizing non-believers (expansion of the church), but on changing the present community (consolidation). In Hermas' time Christianity was expanding. *Hermas'* image of the church as a huge and progressive building project illustrates this historical development and at the same time expresses a sense of optimism and confidence among believers in the author's time. The expansion required the church to find a balance between continuing its work of converting non-believers and focusing on initiatives to improve the existing community. Hermas takes the former as a well-established practice, but aims at the latter.

For the improvement of the church, Hermas calls to μετάνοια, which does not involve any ritual, but means one's personal change: it is a change of attitude,

behaviour, feeling, heart, soul and mind, aiming at moral renewal by regretting one's old self and starting a new life.

Hermas is familiar with Eucharistic meals as real (filling) suppers (*Vis.* 3,9 and *Sim.* 9,11). In the first and second century the Christian community meal was a real meal (δεῖπνον). Hermas' critique on a lack of sharing provisions in *Vis.* 3,9 displays some striking verbal similarities with Paul's critique on the celebration of the Lord's Supper at Corinth in 1 Cor 11,17–34, which indicates that both authors are dealing with a similar topic. The δεῖπνον which is referred to in *Sim.* 9,11,8 seems to hint at the Lord's Supper, because the meeting of Hermas and the virgins probably alludes to the Christian assembly: the gathering takes place around and near the tower (vv. 4–6), which represents the church (9,13,1), and the gathering reflects the twofold pattern of the gatherings of the early Christians, consisting of a δεῖπνον (see ἐδείπνησα[ς] in 9,11,8) and an after-dinner session (see the prayer in v. 7).

Sim. 9,26,2 does not refer to a weekly collection of money in the Sunday gathering. The frequency, the day and the context cannot be substantiated. Furthermore, support of the needy is not described as contributing to any collection, but as providing personal help (*Vis.* 3,9,5; *Man.* 2,4–6; *Sim.* 2,4–9; and 9,27,2) in the form of not only money (*Sim.* 1,8 and 5,3,7), but also food (*Vis.* 3,9,2–3; *Man.* 2,4; *Sim.* 5,2,9; and 9,24,1–3), goods (*Sim.* 2,5,8) and services (*Sim.* 9,27,2).

The dancing (and singing) of Hermas and the virgins in *Sim.* 9,11,4–5 seems to reflect an early Christian custom. Dancing at banquets and symposia was customary throughout the ancient world, as examples in Jewish, Christian and pagan literature show. In *Sim.* 9,11 the dancing takes place in a similar context.

Sim. 9,11,4 refers to the exchange of the holy kiss in the Christian gathering. It shows that even though Justin Martyr is the first Christian author after the period in which the writings later collected in the New Testament originated who explicitly refers to the ritual kiss, it is not true that earlier or contemporary authors do not refer to it at all. In *Hermas* the kiss is a symbolic act within the context of a gathering which alludes to the Christian assembly.

The complexity of the interplay between ideal and reality in Hermas' portrayal of the Christian community in his attempt to build up a community of renewed believers indicates that he was not as "stupid" as some of his more critical interlocutors, like the Shepherd in *Sim.* 9,12,1, suggest.

Bibliography

Abbreviations of journals and series follow S.M. Schwertner, *IATG*³—*Internationales Abkürzungsverzeichnis für Theologie und Grenzgebiete*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 2014³.

1 Primary Sources

- Abbadie, A. d' (ed.), *Hermae Pastor, Aethiopice primum edidit et aethiopica latine vertit Antonius d'Abbadie* (AKM, 2/1), Leipzig, Brockhaus, 1860.
- Adams, C.D. (ed.), *The Speeches of Aeschines: Against Timarchus, On the Embassy, Against Ctesiphon* (LCL), London, Heinemann; New York, Putnam, 1919.
- Audet, J.-P. (ed.), *La Didachè. Instructions des Apôtres*, Paris, Gabalda, 1958.
- Bardy, G. (ed.), *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique*. 4 vols. (SC, 31.41-55-73), Paris, Cerf, 1952, 1955, 1958 and 1960.
- Bartelink, G.J.M. (ed.), *Twee apologeten uit het vroege christendom: Justinus en Athenagoras*, Kampen, Kok, 1986.
- Basore, J.W. (ed.), *Seneca: Moral Essays*. III (LCL, 310), Cambridge, MA – London, Harvard University Press, 1935.
- Becker, C. (ed.), *Tertullian. Apologeticum. Verteidigung des Christentums*, München, Kösel, 1961².
- Bergh van Eysinga, G.A. van den (ed.), *De Apostolische Vaders*. III. *De Herder van Hermas* (Oud-christelijke geschriften in Nederlandse vertaling, 12), Leiden, Sijthoff, 1916.
- Bobichon, P. (ed.), *Justin Martyr. Dialogue avec Tryphon*. 2 vols. (Par., 47), Fribourg, Academic Press Fribourg, 2003.
- Bonner, C. (ed.), *A Papyrus Codex of the Shepherd of Hermas (Similitudes 2–9) with a Fragment of the Mandates* (UMS.H, 22), Ann Arbor, MI, University of Michigan Press, 1934.
- Botte, B. (ed.), *Hippolyte de Rome. La Tradition Apostolique* (SC, 11 bis), Paris, Cerf, 1984².
- Braund, S. (ed.), *Seneca. De clementia*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Brox, N. (ed.), *Irenäus von Lyon. Adversus Haereses. Gegen die Häresien*. II (FC, 8), Freiburg im Breisgau – Basel – Wien – Barcelona – Rome – New York, Herder, 1993.
- , *Irenäus von Lyon. Adversus Haereses. Gegen die Häresien*. IV (FC, 8), Freiburg im Breisgau – Basel – Wien – Barcelona – Rome – New York, Herder, 1997.
- Burchard, C. (ed.), *Joseph und Aseneth* (PVTG, 5), Leiden – Boston, MA, Brill, 2003.
- Carlini, A. (ed.), *Papyrus Pragensis 1*, in R. Pintaudi, R. Dostálová and L. Vidman (eds.), *Papyri Graecae Wessely Pragenses (P.Prag. 1)* (Papyrologica Florentina, 16), Florence, Gonnelli, 1988, pp. 17–25.

- , *Papyrus Bodmer XXXVIII. Erma: Il Pastore (Ia–IIa visione)* (BBod), Cologny – Genève, Fondation Martin Bodmer, 1991.
- Daniel, S. (ed.), *Philon d'Alexandrie. De specialibus legibus I et II*, Paris, Cerf, 1975.
- Daumas, F. and Miquel, P. (eds.), *Philon d'Alexandrie. De vita contemplativa*, Paris, Cerf, 1963.
- Degrassi, A. (ed.), *Inscriptiones Italiae. XIII. Fasti et elogia. II. Fasti anni Numani et Iuliani*, Rome, Istituto Poligrafico dello Stato, 1963.
- Diercks, G.F. and Clarke, G. (eds.), *Sancti Cypriani episcopi epistularium*, Turnhout, Brepols, 1996.
- Dindorf, W. (ed.), *Athanasii Alexandrini Praecepta ad Antiochum*, Leipzig, Weigl, 1857.
- Ehrman, B.D. (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers. I. 1 Clement, 2 Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, Didache* (LCL, 24), Cambridge, MA – London, Harvard University Press, 2003.
- , *The Apostolic Fathers. II. Epistle of Barnabas, Papias and Quadratus, Epistle to Diognetus, The Shepherd of Hermas* (LCL, 25), Cambridge, MA – London, Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Foster, B.O. (ed.), *Livy. I* (LCL), London, Heinemann; New York, Putnam, 1919.
- Franses, D. (ed.), “De Herder” van Hermas, in Id. (ed.), *De Apostolische Vaders*, Hilversum, Brand, 1941, pp. 164–272.
- Funk, F.X. (ed.), *Hermae Pastor*, in Id., *Patres Apostolici. I*, Tübingen, Laupp, 1901², pp. 414–639.
- , *Didascalia et Constitutiones apostolorum. I*, Paderborn, Schöningh, 1905.
- Gebhardt, O. von and Harnack, A. von (eds.), *Hermae Pastor graece, addita versione latina recentiore e codice Palatino* (Patrum Apostolicorum Opera, 3), Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1877.
- Geer, R.M. (ed.), *Diodorus of Sicily. X* (LCL, 390), London, Heinemann; Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1954.
- Godley, A.D. (ed.), *Herodotus. II* (LCL), London, Heinemann; New York, Putnam, 1921.
- , *Herodotus. III* (LCL), London, Heinemann; New York, Putnam, 1922.
- Gummere, R.M. (ed.), *Seneca: Epistles 1–65* (LCL, 75), Cambridge, MA – London, Harvard University Press, 2002¹⁰.
- , *Seneca: Epistles 93–124* (LCL, 77), Cambridge, MA – London, Harvard University Press, 2000⁷.
- Hahneman, G.M. (ed.), *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon* (OTM), New York, Oxford University Press, 1992, pp. 6–7.
- Hammond Bammel, C.P., Frede, H.J. and Stanjek, H. (eds.), *Der Römerbriefkommentar des Origenes. Kritische Ausgabe der Übersetzung Rufins. Buch 7–10* (VL, 34), Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 1998.
- Hefele, C.J. (ed.), *Patrum apostolicorum opera*, Tübingen, Laupp, 1855⁴.
- Henderson, J. (ed.), *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe* (LCL, 69), Cambridge, MA – London, Harvard University Press, 2009.

- Hense, O. (ed.), *C. Musonius Rufus Relinquae* (BSGRT), Leipzig, Teubner, 1905.
- Herdig, W. (ed.), *Hieronymus. De viris illustribus*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1879.
- Hilgenfeld, A., *Hermae Pastor graece*, Leipzig, Weigl, 1866.
- (ed.), *Hermae Pastor. Veterem latinam interpretationem e codicibus*, Leipzig, Reisland, 1873.
- Hoffleit, H.B. (ed.), *Plutarch's Moralia. VIII. 612B–697C* (LCL, 424), London, Heinemann; Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1969.
- Holmes, M.W. (ed.), *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, Grand Rapids, MI, Baker Academic, 2007³.
- Horst, P.W. van der (ed.), *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides: With Introduction and Commentary* (SVTP, 4), Leiden, Brill, 1978.
- Jackson, J. (ed.), *Tacitus. IV. The Annals, Books IV–VI, XI–XII* (LCL, 312), Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, Heinemann, 1937; repr. 1970⁴.
- , *Tacitus. V. The Annals, Books XIII–XVI* (LCL, 322), Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, Heinemann, 1981⁵.
- Junod, E. and Kaestli, J.-D. (eds.), *Acta Iohannis* (CChr.SA, 1), Turnhout, Brepols, 1983.
- Kovacs, D. (ed.), *Euripides: Suppliant Women, Electra, Heracles* (LCL, 9), Cambridge, MA – London, Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Kraus, T.J. and Nicklas, T. (eds.), *Das Petrusevangelium und die Petrusapokalypse. Die griechischen Fragmente mit deutscher und englischer Übersetzung* (GCS, 11; NTApO, 1), Berlin, de Gruyter, 2004.
- Lake, K. (ed.), *Facsimiles of the Athos Fragments of the Shepherd of Hermas*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1907.
- , *Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus: The New Testament, the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1911.
- , *The Apostolic Fathers. II. The Shepherd of Hermas, The Martyrdom of Polycarp, The Epistle to Diognetus* (LCL), Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1948⁶.
- Lappa-Zizicas, E. (ed.), *Cinq fragments du Pasteur d'Hermas dans un manuscrit de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris*, in *RSR* 53 (1965) 251–256.
- Lefort, L.-Th. (ed.), *Les Pères apostoliques en copte. 2 vols.* (CSCO, 135–136), Leuven, Durbecq, 1952.
- Leutzsch, M. (ed.), *Hirt des Hermas*, part two of U.H.J. Körtner and M. Leutzsch (eds.), *Papiasfragmente. Hirt des Hermas* (SUC, 3), Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1998, pp. 105–497.
- Lohse, B. (ed.), *Die Passa-Homilie des Bischofs Meliton von Sardes* (TMUA, 24), Leiden, Brill, 1958.
- Lucchesi, E. (ed.), *Compléments aux Pères apostoliques en copte*, in *AnBoll* 99 (1981) 395–408.
- Lund, A.A. (ed.), *L.A. Seneca, Apocolocyntosis Divi Claudii* (WKLGS), Heidelberg, Winter, 1994.

- MacLeod, M.D. (ed.), *Lucian: Opera. I. Libelli 1–25* (SCBO, 35) Oxford, Clarendon, 1972.
- Mara, M.G. (ed.), *Évangile de Pierre* (SC, 201), Paris, Cerf, 1973.
- Marchant, E.C. (ed.), *Xenophon. Opera omnia. II. Commentarii, Oeconomicus, Convivium, Apologia Socratis* (SCBO, 80), Oxford, Clarendon, 1971⁹.
- Marcovich, M. (ed.), *Athenagoras. Legatio pro Christianis* (PTS, 31), Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 1990.
- , *Clemens Alexandrinus. Paedagogus* (SVigChr, 61), Leiden, Brill, 2002.
- Migne, J.-P. (ed.), *Antiochos* (PG, 89), Paris, 1865, cols. 1415–1856.
- Miller, F.J. and Goold, G.P. (eds.), *Ovid: Metamorphoses, Books IX–XV* (LCL, 34), Cambridge, MA – London, Harvard University Press, 1984²; repr. 1999².
- Miller, W. (ed.), *Xenophon: Cyropaedia. II* (LCL), London, Heinemann; New York, Macmillan, 1914.
- Minar, E.L., Sandbach, F.H. and Helmbold, W.C. (eds.), *Plutarch's Moralia. IX. 697C–771E* (LCL), London, Heinemann; Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1961.
- Minns, D. and Parvis, P. (eds.), *Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: Apologies* (OECT), Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Mommsen, T. (ed.), *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. IX. Inscriptiones Calabriae, Apuliae, Samnii, Sabinorum, Piceni Latinae*, Berlin, Reimer, 1883.
- Moore, C.H. (ed.), *Tacitus. II. The Histories, Books I–III* (LCL, 111), Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, Heinemann, 1980⁶.
- , *Tacitus. III. The Histories, Books IV–V* (LCL, 249), Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, Heinemann, 1979⁶.
- Mosès, A. (ed.), *Philon d'Alexandrie. De specialibus legibus III et IV*, Paris, Cerf, 1970.
- Müller, K. (ed.), *Petronius Arbiter. Satyricon*, München, Heimeran, 1961.
- Munier, C. (ed.), *Tertullien. A son épouse* (SC, 273), Paris, Cerf, 1980.
- Nodet, E. (ed.), *Flavius Josèphe. Les Antiquités Juives. III. Livres VI et VII*, Paris, Cerf, 2001.
- , *Flavius Josèphe. Les Antiquités Juives. IV. Livres VIII et IX*, Paris, Cerf, 2005.
- Norlin, G. (ed.), *Isocrates. I* (LCL), London, Heinemann; New York, Putnam, 1928.
- Oldfather, W.A. (ed.), *Epictetus: The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, the Manuel, and Fragments. I. Discourses, Books I and II* (LCL), London, Heinemann; Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1961³.
- Perry, B.E. (ed.), *Babrius and Phaedrus* (LCL, 436), Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, Heinemann, 1975².
- Radice, B. (ed.), *Pliny: Letters and Panegyricus. I. Letters, Books I–VII* (LCL, 55), London, Heinemann; Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1969.
- , *Pliny: Letters and Panegyricus. II. Letters, Books VIII–X and Panegyricus* (LCL, 59), London, Heinemann; Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 1969.
- Rahlfs, A. and Hanhart, R. (eds.), *Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (2 vols. in 1), Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.

- Rolfe, J.C. (ed.), *Suetonius*. I (LCL, 31), Cambridge, MA – London, Harvard University Press, 1998².
- , *Suetonius*. II (LCL, 38), Cambridge, MA – London, Harvard University Press, 1997².
- Savinell, P. (ed.), *Philon d'Alexandrie. De somniis*, Paris, Cerf, 1962.
- Shackleton Bailey, D.R. (ed.), *Martial: Epigrams*. III (LCL, 480), Cambridge, MA – London, Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Shipley, F.W. (ed.), *Velleius Paterculus: Compendium of Roman History. Res Gestae Divi Augusti* (LCL, 152), Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press; London, Heinemann, 1967⁴.
- Smith, M.S. (ed.), *Petronius Arbiter. Cena Trimalchionis*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1975.
- Tornau, C. and Cecconi, P. (eds.), *The Shepherd of Hermas in Latin: Critical Edition of the Oldest Translation Vulgata* (TU, 173), Berlin, de Gruyter, 2014.
- West, M.L. (ed.), *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer* (LCL, 496), Cambridge, MA – London, Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Whittaker, M. (ed.), *Die Apostolischen Väter*. I. *Der Hirt des Hermas* (GCS, 48), Berlin, Akademie, 1967².
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (ed.), *Heilige Gesetze. Eine Urkunde aus Kyrene*, in *SPAW.PH* (1927) 155–176.

2 Secondary Sources

- Achelis, H., *Virgines subintroductae. Ein Beitrag zum VII. Kapitel des 1. Korintherbriefs*, Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1902.
- , *Agapētae*, in *ERE* 1 (1908) 177–180.
- Aland, K., *Noch einmal: Das Problem der Anonymität und Pseudonymität in der christlichen Literatur der ersten beiden Jahrhunderte*, in E. Dassmann and K. Suso Frank (eds.), *Pietas. Festschrift für Bernhard Kötting* (JbAC.E, 8), Münster, Aschendorf, 1980, pp. 121–139.
- Aldrete, G.S., *Gestures and Acclamations in Ancient Rome* (Ancient Society and History), Baltimore, MD – London, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.
- Alès, A. d', *L'édit de Calliste. Études sur l'origine de la pénitence chrétienne*, Paris, Bauchesne, 1914.
- Alföldi, A., *Die monarchische Repräsentation im römischen Kaiserreiche*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980³.
- Alikin, V.A., *The Earliest History of the Christian Gathering: Origin, Development and Content of the Christian Gathering in the First to Third Centuries* (SVigChr, 102), Leiden – Boston, MA, Brill, 2010.

- Altaner, B. and Stuiber, A., *Patrologie. Leben, Schriften und Lehre der Kirchenväter*, Freiburg im Breisgau – Basel – Wien, Herder, 1980⁹.
- Ambra, E. D', *The Calculus of Venus: Nude Portraits of Roman Matrons*, in N.B. Kampen (ed.), *Sexuality in Ancient Art: Near East, Egypt, Greece, and Italy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996, pp. 219–232.
- Amstutz, J., *Ἀπλότης. Eine begriffsgeschichtliche Studie zum jüdisch-christlichen Griechisch* (Theoph., 19), Bonn, Hanstein, 1968.
- Andresen, C., *Altchristliche Kritik am Tanz—ein Ausschnitt aus dem Kampf der alten Kirche gegen heidnische Sitte*, in H. Frohnes and U.W. Knorr (eds.), *Kirchengeschichte als Missionsgeschichte. 1. Die alte Kirche*, München, Kaiser, 1974, pp. 344–376.
- Angelo, M.R. D', *(Re)presentations of Women in the Gospel of Matthew and Luke-Acts*, in R.S. Kraemer and M.R. D'Angelo (eds.), *Women & Christian Origins*, New York – Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 171–195.
- , *Roman Imperial Family Values and the Gospel of Mark: The Divorce Sayings (Mark 10:2–12)*, in S.P. Ahearne-Kroll, P.A. Holloway and J.A. Kelhoffer (eds.), *Women and Gender in Ancient Religions: Interdisciplinary Approaches* (WUNT, 263), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2010, pp. 59–83.
- Arbesmann, R., *Fasting and Prophecy in Pagan and Christian Antiquity*, in *Tr.* 7 (1949–1951) 1–71.
- Arms, J. D', *The Roman Convivium and the Idea of Equality*, in O. Murray (ed.), *Symptotica: A Symposium on the Symposium*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1990, pp. 308–320.
- Audet, J.-P., *Affinités littéraires et doctrinales du Manuel de Discipline*, in *RB* 59 (1952) 219–238 and 60 (1953) 41–82.
- Aune, D.E., *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*, Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 1983.
- , *Worship, Early Christian*, in *ABD* 6 (1992) 973–989.
- , *Revelation 6–16* (WBC, 52b), Nashville, TN, Nelson, 1998.
- Avemarie, F. and Lichtenberger, H. (eds.), *Auferstehung—Resurrection. The Fourth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium: Resurrection, Transfiguration and Exaltation in Old Testament, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Tübingen, September, 1999) (WUNT, 135), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Bagatti, B., *The Church from the Circumcision: History and Archeology of the Judaeo-Christians* (trans. E. Hoade; PSBF.Mi, 2), Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 1971.
- Bakel, H.A. van, *De compositie van den Pastor Hermae*, Amsterdam, De Roever Kröber & Bakels, 1900.
- Barnard, L.W., *Studies in the Apostolic Fathers and Their Background*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1966.
- , *The Shepherd of Hermas in Recent Study*, in *HeyJ* 9 (1968) 29–36.
- Bauckham, R.J., *The Great Tribulation in the Shepherd of Hermas*, in *JThS* 25 (1974) 27–40.

- Bauer, W., *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1909.
- , *Der Wortgottesdienst der ältesten Christen*, in Id., *Aufsätze und Kleine Schriften*, ed. G. Strecker, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1967, pp. 155–209.
- Bauer, W., Aland, K. and Aland, B., *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur*, Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 1988⁶.
- Baumgärtner, P., *Die Einheit des Hermas-Buchs*, Freiburg im Breisgau, Mohr Siebeck, 1889.
- Baus, K., *Von der Urgemeinde zur frühchristlichen Grosskirche* (HKG[J], 1), Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 1965³.
- Benko, S., *Pagan Rome and the Early Christians*, Bloomington, IN, Indiana University Press, 1984.
- Berger, T., *Liturgie und Tanz. Anthropologische Aspekte, historische Daten, theologische Perspektiven*, St. Ottilien, EOS, 1985.
- Berthelot, K., *Philanthrôpia judaica. Le débat autour de la “misanthropie” des lois juives dans l’Antiquité* (JSJ.S, 76), Leiden, Brill, 2003.
- Blomkvist, V., *The Teaching on Baptism in the Shepherd of Hermas*, in D. Hellholm, T. Vegge, Ø. Norderval and C. Hellholm (eds.), *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism. Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity / Waschungen, Initiation und Taufe. Spätantike, Frühes Judentum und Frühes Christentum*. II (BZNW, 176), Berlin, de Gruyter, 2011, pp. 849–870.
- Bolt, P.G., *Life, Death and the Afterlife in the Greco-Roman World*, in R.N. Longenecker (ed.), *Life in the Face of Death: The Resurrection Message in the New Testament*, Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 1998, pp. 51–79.
- Bousset, W., *Kyrios Christos. Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus* (FRLANT, 21), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921².
- Bowe, B.E., *Dancing into the Divine: The Hymn of the Dance in the Acts of John*, in *JECS* 7 (1999) 83–104.
- Bradshaw, P.F., *Eucharistic Origins*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Brandenburg, H., *Studien zur Mitra. Beiträge zur Waffen- und Trachtgeschichte der Antike* (FC, 4), Münster, Aschendorff, 1966.
- Brennecke, H.C., ‘*An fidelis ad militiam converti possit?*’ [*Tertullian, de idolatria* 19,1]. *Frühchristliches Bekenntnis und Militärdienst im Widerspruch?*, in D. Wyrwa, B. Aland and C. Schäublin (eds.), *Die Weltlichkeit des Glaubens in der Alten Kirche. FS Ulrich Wickert* (BZNW, 85), Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 1997, pp. 45–100.
- Brent, A., *The Imperial Cult and the Development of Church Order: Concepts and Images of Authority in Paganism and Early Christianity before the Age of Cyprian* (SVigChr, 45), Leiden, Brill, 1999.

- Brien, D. O', *Entering the Kingdom with Difficulty: The Self-Sufficient Life as the Quest for Wealthy Believers in the Shepherd of Hermas and Clement of Alexandria's Quis Dives Salvetur and Paedagogus*, in *StPatr* 45 (2010) 325–330.
- Brilliant, R., *Gesture and Rank in Roman Art: The Use of Gestures to Denote Status in Roman Sculpture and Coinage* (MCAA, 14), New Haven, CT, Academy of Arts & Sciences, 1963.
- Brown, F., Driver, S. and Briggs, C., *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*, Peabody, MA, Hendrickson, 2001⁶.
- Brown, P., *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (LHR, 13), New York, Columbia University Press, 1988.
- Brox, N., *Der erste Petrusbrief* (EKK, 21), Zürich – Einsiedeln – Köln, Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1979.
- , *Der Hirt des Hermas* (KAV, 7), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
- Bruin, T. de, *The Great Controversy: The Individual's Struggle between Good and Evil in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and in Their Jewish and Christian Contexts* (NTOA, 106), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2015.
- Bucur, B.G., *The Son of God and the Angelomorphic Holy Spirit: A Rereading of the Shepherd's Christology*, in *ZNW* 98 (2007) 120–142.
- , *Angelomorphic Pneumatology: Clement of Alexandria and Other Early Christian Witnesses* (SVigChr, 95), Leiden, Brill, 2009.
- Campenhausen, H. von, *Kirchliches Amt und geistliche Vollmacht in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (BHTh, 14), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1953.
- Carleton Paget, J., *Jewish Christianity*, in W. Horbury, W.D. Davies and J. Sturdy (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism. III. The Early Roman Period*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp. 731–775.
- , *The Definition of the Terms Jewish Christian and Jewish Christianity in the History of Research*, in O. Skarsaune and R. Hvalvik (eds.), *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries*, Peabody, MA, Hendrickson, 2007, pp. 22–52.
- Carlini, A., *La tradizione testuale del Pastore di Erma e i nuovi papiri*, in G. Cavallo (ed.), *Le Strade del Testo*, Lecce, Adriatica Editrice, 1987, pp. 23–43.
- , *Μετανοεῖν e μεταμέλῃσθαι nelle visioni di Erma*, in S. Janeras (ed.), *Miscellània papirologica Ramón Roca-Puig*, Barcelona, Fundació Salvador Vives Casajuana, 1987, pp. 97–102.
- , *Testimone e testo: Il problema della datazione di P¹Iand I 4 del Pastore di Erma*, in *SCO* 42 (1992) 17–30.
- Carter, W., *Matthew and the Margins: A Socio-Political and Religious Reading* (JSNTS, 204), Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Casey, P.M., *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God: The Origins and Development of New Testament Christology. The Edward Cadbury Lectures at the University of Birmingham, 1985–1986*, Cambridge, Clarke; Louisville, KY, Westminster – John Knox, 1991.

- Chadwick, H., *A New Edition of Hermas*, in *JThS* 8 (1957) 274–280.
- Chalcraft, D.J., *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances? Some Critical Sociological Reflections*, in Id. (ed.), *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (BWo), London – Oakville, Equinox, 2007, pp. 2–23.
- Champagny, F. de, *Les Antonins – ans de J.-C.*, 69–180–. I. Paris, Bray, 1866.
- Christ, W. von, Schmid, W. and Stählin, O., *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur*. II. *Die nachklassische Periode der griechischen Litteratur*. II. *Von 100 bis 530 nach Christus* (HAW, 7), München, Beck, 1924⁶.
- Cirillo, L., *Conférences sur les idées et le vocabulaire juifs du Pasteur d'Hermas*, in *AEPHE*.R 80–81 (1971–1973) 336–337.
- , *Erma e il problema dell'apocalittica a Roma*, in *CrSt* 4 (1983) 1–31.
- Clark, E.A., *John Chrysostom and the Subintroductae*, in *ChH* 46 (1977) 171–185.
- Clark, K.W., *The Sins of Hermas*, in A. Wikgren (ed.), *Early Christian Origins: Studies in Honor of Harold R. Willoughby*, Chicago, IL, Quadrangle, 1961, pp. 102–119; repr. in J.L. Sharpe (ed.), *The Gentile Bias and Other Essays* (NT.S, 54), Leiden, Brill, 1980, pp. 30–48.
- Cleveland Coxe, A., *Introductory Note to the Pastor of Hermas*, in A. Roberts, J. Donaldson and A. Cleveland Coxe (eds.), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to AD 325*. II. *Fathers of the Second Century: Hermas, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Clement of Alexandria* (American reprint of the Edinburgh edition), Edinburgh, T&T Clark; Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, 1994, pp. 3–6.
- Coleborne, W., *A Linguistic Approach to the Problem of Structure and Composition of the Shepherd of Hermas* (PhD thesis, University of Newcastle, 1965).
- , *A Linguistic Approach to the Problem of Structure and Composition of the Shepherd of Hermas*, in *Coll(A)* 3 (1969) 133–142.
- , *The Shepherd of Hermas: A Case for Multiple Authorship and Some Implications*, in *StPatr* 10 = TU 107 (1970) 65–70.
- Collins, A.Y., *Persecution and Vengeance in the Book of Revelation*, in D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1983, pp. 729–749.
- , *Mark: A Commentary* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 2007.
- , *Ancient Notions of Transferral and Apotheosis in Relation to the Empty Tomb Story in Mark*, in T.K. Seim and J. Økland (eds.), *Metamorphoses: Resurrection, Body and Transformative Practices in Early Christianity* (Ekstasis, 1), Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 2009, pp. 41–57.
- Collins, J.J., *The Afterlife in Apocalyptic Literature*, in A.J. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner (eds.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity*. IV. *Death, Life-After-Death, Resurrection and the World-to-Come in the Judaism of Late Antiquity* (HO, 1/49), Leiden, Brill, 2000, pp. 119–139.

- , *The Angelic Life*, in T.K. Seim and J. Økland (eds.), *Metamorphoses: Resurrection, Body and Transformative Practices in Early Christianity* (Ekstasis, 1), Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 2009, pp. 291–310.
- Collins, J.N., *Diakonia: Re-interpreting the Ancient Sources*, New York – Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Cotelier, J.-B. and Clerc, J. le, ss. *Patrum qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt, Barnabae, Clementis, Hermae, Ignatii, Polycarpi* [etc.]. 1, Antwerp, Huguetani, 1698.
- Cox, C.E., *The Reading of the Personal Letter as the Background for the Reading of the Scriptures in the Early Church*, in A.J. Malherbe, F.W. Norris and J.W. Thompson (eds.), *The Early Church in Its Context. Essays in Honor of Everett Ferguson* (NT.S, 90), Leiden, Brill, 1998, pp. 74–91.
- Crombie, F., *The Pastor of Hermas*, in A. Roberts, J. Donaldson and A. Cleveland Coxe (eds.), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to AD 325. II. Fathers of the Second Century: Hermas, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Clement of Alexandria* (American reprint of the Edinburgh edition), Edinburgh, T&T Clark; Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI, 1994, pp. 6–58.
- Daniélou, J., *Les manuscrits de la Mer Morte et les origines du christianisme*, Paris, Éditions de l'Orante, 1957.
- , *Théologie du judéo-christianisme* (BT.HD, 1), Paris, Desclée – Cerf, 1958.
- Deemter, R. van, *Der Hirt des Hermas: Apokalypse oder Allegorie?*, Delft, Meinema, 1929.
- Delobel, J. et al. (eds.), *Vroegchristelijke gemeenten tussen werkelijkheid en ideaal. Opstellen van leden van de Studiosorum Novi Testamenti Conventus*, Kampen, Kok, 2001.
- Dewey, A.J., *The Hymn in the Acts of John: Dance as Hermeneutics*, in *Semeia* 38 (1986) 67–80.
- Dibelius, M., *Der Hirt des Hermas* (HNT Erg. Die Apostolischen Väter, 4), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1923.
- Dihle, A., *Die Goldene Regel. Eine Einführung in die Geschichte der antiken und früh-christlichen Vulgärethik* (SAW, 7), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.
- Dix, G., *The Shape of the Liturgy*, Glasgow, Glasgow University Press, 1945²; repr. Westminster, Dacre, 1949.
- Dixon, S., *Sex and the Married Woman in Ancient Rome*, in D.L. Balch and C. Osiek (eds.), *Early Christian Families in Context: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue* (Religion, Marriage, and Family), Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, U.K., Eerdmans, 2003, pp. 111–129.
- Dölger, F.J., *Sphragis. Eine altchristliche Taufbezeichnung in ihren Beziehungen zur profanen und religiösen Kultur des Altertums* (SGKA, 5), Paderborn, Schöningh, 1911.
- , *Klingeln, Tanz und Händeklatschen im Gottesdienst der christlichen Melitaner in Ägypten*, in *AC* 4 (1934) 245–265.

- Donfried, K.P., *The Imperial Cults of Thessalonica and Political Conflict in 1 Thessalonians*, in R.A. Horsley (ed.), *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*, Harrisburg, PA, Trinity, 1997, pp. 215–223.
- Drexhage, H.-J., *Wirtschaft und Handel in den frühchristlichen Gemeinden (1.–3. Jh. n. Chr.)*, in *RQ* 76 (1981) 1–72.
- Duchesne, L., *Histoire ancienne de l'église*. I, Paris, Fontemoing, 1907.
- Dunn, J.D.G., *The Parting of the Ways between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity*, London, SCM; Philadelphia, PA, Trinity, 1991.
- Dupont-Sommer, A., *Nouveaux aperçus sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (OAI, 5), Maisonneuve, Paris, 1953.
- Eckert, J., *Das Imperium Romanum im Neuen Testament. Ein Beitrag zum Thema 'Kirche und Gesellschaft'*, in *TThZ* 96 (1987) 253–271.
- Ehrhart, A., *Der Hirte des Hermas*, in Id., *Die altchristliche Litteratur und ihre Erforschung von 1884–1900*. I. *Die vornicänische Litteratur*, Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 1900, pp. 100–111.
- Eijk, T.H.C. van, *La résurrection des morts chez les Pères apostoliques* (ThH, 25), Paris, Beauchesne, 1974.
- Enslin, M.S., *A Second Century Pastor*, in *CrozQ* 6 (1929) 278–298.
- Ernst, U., *Der Hirt des Hermas. Ver-führung zum Umdenken in der erotischen Sophiakirche*, in L. Schottroff and M.-T. Wacker (eds.), *Kompendium Feministische Bibelauslegung*, Gütersloh, Kaiser – Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1998, pp. 778–788.
- Ford, J.M., *A Possible Liturgical Background to the Shepherd of Hermas*, in *RdQ* 6 (1969) 531–551.
- Foster, P., *The Gospel of Peter: Introduction, Critical Edition and Commentary* (TENT, 4), Leiden, Brill, 2010.
- , *Marcion: His Life, Works, Beliefs, and Impact*, in *ET* 121(6) (2010) 269–280.
- Frei, H.A., *Metanoia im 'Hirten' des Hermas*, in *IKZ* 64 (1974) 118–139. 189–201 and 65 (1975) 120–138. 176–204.
- Frenschkowski, M., *Kyrios in Context: Q 6:46, the Emperor as "Lord", and the Political Implications of Christology in Q*, in M. Labahn and J. Zangenberg (eds.), *Zwischen den Reichen. Neues Testament und Römische Herrschaft. Vorträge auf der Ersten Konferenz der European Association for Biblical Studies* (TANZ, 36), Tübingen – Basel, Francke, 2002, pp. 95–118.
- , *Visionen als Imagination. Beobachtungen zum differenzierten Wirklichkeitsanspruch frühchristlicher Visionsliteratur*, in N. Hömke and M. Baumbach (eds.), *Fremde Wirklichkeiten. Literarische Phantastik und antike Literatur* (Kalliope, 6), Heidelberg, Winter, 2006, pp. 339–366.
- Frijhoff, W., *The Kiss Sacred and Profane: Reflections on a Cross-Cultural Confrontation*, in J. Bremmer and H. Roodenburg (eds.), *A Cultural History of Gesture: From Antiquity to the Present Day*, Cambridge, Polity, 1991, pp. 210–236.

- Fuhrmann, S., *Leben verlieren und Leben finden. Nachfolge und Martyrium in den Evangelien*, in Id. and R. Grundmann (eds.), *Martyriumsvorstellungen in Antike und Mittelalter. Leben oder sterben für Gott?* (AGJU, 80), Leiden, Brill, 2012, pp. 167–189.
- Funk, F.X., *Die Einheit des Hirten des Hermas*, in *ThQ* 81 (1899) 321–360; repr. in Id., *Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen*. III. Paderborn, Schöningh, 1907, pp. 230–261.
- Gamble, H.Y., *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*, New Haven, CT – London, Yale University Press, 1995.
- , *Literacy, Liturgy, and the Shaping of the New Testament Canon*, in C. Horton (ed.), *The Earliest Gospels: The Origins and Transmission of the Earliest Christian Gospels—The Contribution of the Chester Beatty Gospel Codex, P⁴⁵* (JSNTS, 258), London – New York, T&T Clark, 2004, pp. 27–39.
- Garleff, G., *Urchristliche Identität in Matthäusevangelium, Didache und Jakobusbrief* (Beiträge zum Verstehen der Bibel, 9), Münster, LIT, 2004.
- Garrett, S.R., *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings*, Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 1989.
- Garrison, R., *Redemptive Almsgiving in Early Christianity* (JSNTS, 77), Sheffield, JSOT, 1993.
- Giet, S., *Hermas et les pasteurs. Les trois auteurs du Pasteur d'Hermas*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1963.
- , *Les trois auteurs du Pasteur d'Hermas*, in *StPatr* 8 = TU 93 (1966) 10–23.
- Goldhahn-Müller, I., *Die Grenze der Gemeinde. Studien zum Problem der Zweiten Buße im Neuen Testament unter Berücksichtigung der Entwicklung im 2. Jh. bis Tertullian* (GTA, 39), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
- Goppelt, L., *Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert. Ein Aufriß der Urgeschichte der Kirche* (BFChTh, 55), Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1954.
- Grabbe, L.L., *When Is a Sect a Sect—or Not? Groups and Movements in the Second Temple Period*, in D.J. Chalcraft (ed.), *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (BWo), London – Oakville, Equinox, 2007, pp. 114–132.
- Gregory, A., *Disturbing Trajectories: 1 Clement, the Shepherd of Hermas and the Development of Early Roman Christianity*, in P. Oakes (ed.), *Rome in the Bible and the Early Church*, Carlisle, Paternoster, 2002, pp. 142–166.
- Grillmeier, A., *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche. I. Von der Apostolischen Zeit bis zum Konzil von Chalcedon (451)*, Freiburg im Breisgau – Basel – Wien, Herder, 1979.
- Gross, K., *Menschenhand und Gotteshand in Antike und Christentum*, Stuttgart, Hiersemann, 1985.
- Grotz, J., *Die Entwicklung des Bußstufenwesens in der vornicänischen Kirche*, Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 1955.
- Grundeken, M., *Resurrection of the Dead in the Shepherd of Hermas. A Matter of Dispute*, in G. Van Oyen and T. Shepherd (eds.), *Resurrection of the Dead: Biblical Traditions in Dialogue* (BETL, 249), Leuven, Peeters, 2012, pp. 403–416.

- Grundeken, M. and Verheyden, J., *The Spirit Before the Letter: Dreams and Visions as the Legitimation of the Shepherd of Hermas. A Study of Vision 5*, in B. Koet (ed.), *Dreams as Divine Communication in Christianity: From Hermas to Aquinas* (Studies in the History and Anthropology of Religion, 3), Leuven, Peeters, 2012, pp. 23–56.
- Grundeken, M., “A Jan Steen Household”: *The Domestic Church in the Shepherd of Hermas*, in T. Knieps, G. Mannion and P. De Mey (eds.), *The Household of God and Local Households: Revisiting the Domestic Church* (BETL, 254), Leuven, Peeters, 2013, pp. 235–247.
- , *The Shepherd of Hermas and the Roman Empire*, in M. Labahn and O. Lehtipuu (eds.), *People under Power: Early Jewish and Christian Responses to the Roman Empire* (Early Christianity in the Roman World), Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press, 2015, pp. 189–205.
- , *Baptism and Μετάνοια in the Shepherd of Hermas*, in Id. and J. Verheyden (eds.), *Early Christian Communities between Ideal and Reality* (WUNT, 342), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2015, pp. 127–142.
- Gülzow, H., *Christentum und Sklaverei in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Bonn, Habelt, 1969.
- Guttenberger, G., *Why Caesarea Philippi of all Sites? Some Reflections on the Political Background and Implications of Mark 8:27–30 for the Christology of Mark*, in M. Labahn and J. Zangenber (eds.), *Zwischen den Reichen. Neues Testament und Römische Herrschaft. Vorträge auf der Ersten Konferenz der European Association for Biblical Studies* (TANZ, 36), Tübingen – Basel, Francke, 2002, pp. 119–131.
- Haas, C., *De geest bewaren. Achtergrond en functie van de pneumatologie in de paraenese van de Pastor van Hermas*, Den Haag, Boekencentrum, 1985.
- Hagan, A.P. O’, *The Great Tribulation to Come in the Pastor of Hermas*, in *StPatr* 4 = TU 79 (1961) 305–311.
- Hagemann, H., *Der Hirt des Hermas*, in *ThQ* 42 (1860) 1–40.
- Hahneman, G.M., *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon* (OTM), New York, Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Haines-Eitzen, K., *Guardians of Letters: Literacy, Power, and the Transmitters of Early Christian Literature*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Hallett, J.P., *Women’s Lives in the Ancient Mediterranean*, in R.S. Kraemer and M.R. D’Angelo (eds.), *Women & Christian Origins*, New York – Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 13–34.
- Hamman, A., *Naissance des lettres chrétiennes. Odes de Salomon, Lettre de Barnabé, Symbole des Apôtres, Didachè, Pasteur d’Hermas*, Paris, Éditions de Paris, 1957.
- Hands, A.R., *Charities and Social Aid in Greece and Rome* (Aspects of Greek and Roman Life), London – Southampton, Thames and Hudson, 1968.
- Hanson, A.T., *Hodayoth vi and viii and Hermas Sim. VIII*, in *StPatr* 10 = TU 107 (1970) 105–108.

- Harnack, A. von, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*. II. *Die Verbreitung*, Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1924⁴.
- , *Das Alte Testament in den paulinischen Briefen und in den paulinischen Gemeinden*, in *SBAW.PH* (1928) 124–141.
- , *Κόπος (κοπιᾶν, οἱ κοπιῶντες) im frühchristlichen Sprachgebrauch*, in *ZNW* 27 (1928) 1–10.
- Harris, J.R., *On the Angelology of Hermas* (originally published in *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* III nr. 30 [1884]), in Id., *Hermas in Arcadia and Other Essays*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1896, pp. 21–25.
- Hasler, V.E., *Gesetz und Evangelium in der alten Kirche bis Origenes. Eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, Zürich – Frankfurt am Main, Gotthelf, 1953.
- Hausleiter, J., *De versionibus Pastoris Hermae latinis* (Acta Seminarii Philologici Erlangensis, 3), Erlangen, Jungius, 1884.
- Hellholm, D., *Das Visionenbuch des Hermas als Apokalypse. Formgeschichtliche und texttheoretische Studien zu einer literarischen Gattung*. 1. *Methodologische Vorüberlegungen und makrostrukturelle Textanalyse* (CB.NT, 13), Lund, Gleerup, 1980.
- , *Der Hirt des Hermas*, in W. Pratscher (ed.), *Die Apostolischen Väter. Eine Einleitung* (UTB, 3272), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009, pp. 226–253.
- Henne, P., *La pénitence et la rédaction du Pasteur d'Hermas*, in *RB* 98 (1991) 358–397.
- , *La christologie chez Clément de Rome et dans le Pasteur d'Hermas* (Par., 33), Fribourg, Éditions Universitaires, 1992.
- , *L'unité du Pasteur d'Hermas. Tradition et rédaction* (CRB, 31), Paris, Gabalda, 1992.
- , *Un seul 'Pasteur', un seul Hermas*, in *RTL* 23 (1992) 482–488.
- Hilgenfeld, A., *Die apostolischen Väter. Untersuchungen über Inhalt und Ursprung der unter ihrem Namen erhaltenen Schriften*, Halle, Pfeffer, 1853.
- Hilhorst, A., *Sémitismes et latinismes dans le Pasteur d'Hermas* (GCP, 5), Nijmegen, Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1976.
- , *Hermas*, in *RAC* 14 (1988) 682–701.
- Hill, C.E., *Regnum Caelorum: Patterns of Future Hope in Early Christianity* (OECs), Oxford, Clarendon, 1992.
- Hörmann, K., *Leben in Christus. Zusammenhänge zwischen Dogma und Sitte bei den Apostolischen Vätern*, Wien, Herold, 1952.
- Hort, F.J.A., *Hermas and Theodotion* (originally published in *Johns Hopkins University Circulars* IV nr. 35 [1884]), in J.R. Harris, *Hermas in Arcadia and Other Essays*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1896, pp. 23–24.
- Hübner, R.M., *Die Anfänge von Diakonat, Presbyterat und Episkopat in der frühen Kirche*, in A. Rauch and P. Imhof (eds.), *Das Priestertum in der Einen Kirche. Diakonat, Presbyterat und Episkopat. Regensburger Ökumenisches Symposium 1985, im Auftrag*

- der Ökumene-Kommission der Deutschen Bischofskonferenz, 15.7. bis 21.7.1985 (Koin., 4), Aschaffenburg, Kaffke, 1987, pp. 45–89.
- Huß, B., *Xenophons Symposium. Ein Kommentar* (BzA, 125), Stuttgart – Leipzig, Teubner, 1999.
- Hvalvik, R., *Jewish Believers and Jewish Influence in the Roman Church until the Early Second Century*, in O. Skarsaune and R. Hvalvik (eds.), *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries*, Peabody, MA, Hendrickson, 2007, pp. 179–216.
- Jackson-McCabe, M.A. (ed.), *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*, Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 2007.
- , *What's in a Name? The Problem of 'Jewish Christianity'*, in Id. (ed.), *Jewish Christianity Reconsidered: Rethinking Ancient Groups and Texts*, Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 2007, pp. 7–38.
- Jeffers, J.S., *Conflict at Rome: Social Order and Hierarchy in Early Christianity*, Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 1991.
- , *Jewish and Christian Families in First-Century Rome*, in K.P. Donfried and P. Richardson (eds.), *Judaism and Christianity in First-Century Rome*, Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, Eerdmans, 1998, pp. 128–150.
- Jensen, A., *Frauen im frühen Christentum* (TC, 11), Bern, Peter Lang, 2002.
- Johnson, B., *On Church and Sect*, in ASR 28 (1963) 539–549.
- Joly, R., *La doctrine pénitentielle du Pasteur d'Hermas et l'exégèse récente*, in RHR 147 (1955) 32–49.
- , *Hermas. Le Pasteur* (SC, 53), Paris, Cerf, 1958.
- , *Hermas et le pasteur*, in VigChr 21 (1967) 201–218.
- , *Le milieu complexe du Pasteur d'Hermas*, in ANRW 2.27.1 (1993) 524–551.
- Jonge, H.J. de, *The Early History of the Lord's Supper*, in J.W. van Henten and A. Houtepen (eds.), *Religious Identity and the Invention of Tradition* (STAR, 3), Assen, Van Gorcum, 2001, pp. 209–237.
- , *The Apocalypse of John and the Imperial Cult*, in H.F.J. Horstmanshoff et al. (eds.), *Kykeon: Studies in Honour of H.S. Versnel* (RGRW, 142), Leiden, Brill, 2002, pp. 127–141.
- , *The New Testament Canon*, in J.-M. Auwers and H.J. de Jonge (eds.), *The Biblical Canons* (BETL, 163), Leuven, Peeters, 2003, pp. 309–319.
- , *The Function of Religious Polemics: The Case of the Revelation of John versus the Imperial Cult*, in T.L. Hettema, A. van der Kooij and J.A.M. Snoek (eds.), *Religious Polemics in Context* (STAR, 11), Assen, Van Gorcum, 2004, pp. 276–290.
- , *Avondmaal en symposium. Oorsprong en eerste ontwikkeling van de vroeg-christelijke samenkomst. Afscheidsrede Universiteit Leiden*, Leiden, 2007.
- , *The Use of the Old Testament in Scripture Readings in Early Christian Assemblies*, in B.J. Koet, S. Moyise and J. Verheyden (eds.), *The Scriptures of Israel in Jewish and Christian Tradition. Essays in Honour of Maarten J.J. Menken* (NT.S, 148), Leiden, Brill, 2013, pp. 377–392.

- Jordan, H., *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, Leipzig, Quelle & Meyer, 1911.
- Jungmann, J.A., *Missarum sollemnia. Eine genetische Erklärung der Römischen Messe*. 1. *Messe im Wandel der Jahrhunderte. Messe und kirchliche Gemeinschaft. Vormesse*, Wien – Freiburg im Breisgau – Basel, Herder, 1962⁵.
- Kabiersch, J., *Untersuchungen zum Begriff der Philanthropia bei dem Kaiser Julian* (KPS, 21), Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz, 1960.
- Kamlah, E., *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament* (WUNT, 7), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1964.
- Kelly, J.N.D., *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles: I Timothy, II Timothy, Titus* (BNTC), London, Black, 1963.
- Klassen, W., *The Sacred Kiss in the New Testament: An Example of Social Boundary Lines*, in *NTS* 39 (1993) 122–135.
- Klevinghaus, J., *Die theologische Stellung der Apostolischen Väter zur alttestamentlichen Offenbarung* (BFChTh, 44), Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1948.
- Klijn, A.F.J. and Reinink, G.J. (eds.), *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects* (NT.S, 36), Leiden, Brill, 1973.
- Klinghardt, M., *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft. Soziologie und Liturgie frühchristlicher Mahlfeiern* (TANZ, 13), Tübingen – Basel, Francke, 1996.
- , *Tanz und Offenbarung. Praxis und Theologie des gottesdienstlichen Tanzes im frühen Christentum*, in *SpCh* 15–16 (2004–2005) 11–34.
- Koester, H., *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern* (TU, 65 = 5,10), Berlin, Akademie, 1957.
- , *Einführung in das Neue Testament im Rahmen der Religionsgeschichte und Kulturgeschichte der hellenistischen und römischen Zeit*, Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 1980.
- Kraeling, C.H., *Music in the Bible*, in E. Wellez (ed.), *New Oxford History of Music*. 1. *Ancient and Oriental Music*, London, Oxford University Press, 1957, pp. 283–312.
- Kraemer, R.S. and D'Angelo, M.R. (eds.), *Women & Christian Origins*, New York – Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999.
- , *Introduction*, in Eaed. (eds.), *Women & Christian Origins*, New York – Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 3–10.
- Kraft, H., *Clavis Patrum Apostolicorum*, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963 (1964).
- Kretschmar, G., *Studien zur frühchristlichen Trinitätstheologie* (BHTh, 21), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1956.
- Kümmel, W.G., *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Heidelberg, Quelle & Meyer, 1973¹⁷.
- Labahn, M. and Zangenberg, J. (eds.), *Zwischen den Reichen. Neues Testament und Römische Herrschaft. Vorträge auf der Ersten Konferenz der European Association for Biblical Studies* (TANZ, 36), Tübingen – Basel, Francke, 2002.
- Labriolle, P. de, *Le 'mariage spirituel' dans l'Antiquité chrétienne*, in *RH* 137 (1921) 204–225.

- Lake, K., *Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity* (The Beginnings of Christianity), London, MacMillan, 1920.
- Lampe, P., *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten* (WUNT 11, 18), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1989².
- Lane, W.L., *Social Perspectives on Roman Christianity during the Formative Years from Nero to Nerva: Romans, Hebrews, 1 Clement*, in K.P. Donfried and P. Richardson (eds.), *Judaism and Christianity in First-Century Rome*, Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, Eerdmans, 1998, pp. 196–244.
- Lane Fox, R., *Pagans and Christians in the Mediterranean World from the Second Century AD to the Conversion of Constantine*, Harmondsworth, Viking, 1986.
- Lebreton, J., *Histoire du dogme de la Trinité. Des origines au Concile de Nicée. II. De Saint Clément a Saint Irénée* (BTH), Paris, Beauchesne, 1928³.
- Lehtipuu, O., *The Example of Thecla and the Example(s) of Paul: Disputing Women's Roles in Early Christianity*, in S.P. Ahearne-Kroll, P.A. Holloway and J.A. Kelhoffer (eds.), *Women and Gender in Ancient Religions: Interdisciplinary Approaches* (WUNT, 263), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2010, pp. 349–378.
- Leipoldt, J., *Die Frau in der antiken Welt und im Urchristentum*, Leipzig, Koehler & Amelang, 1965³.
- Leon, H., *The Jews of Ancient Rome*, Peabody, MA, Hendrickson, 1994.
- Leutzsch, M., *Die Wahrnehmung sozialer Wirklichkeit im "Hirten des Hermas"* (FRLANT, 150), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
- , *Gemeinde und Gesellschaft. Die Wahrnehmung des Nichtchristlichen im "Hirten des Hermas"*, in Id., *Die Wahrnehmung sozialer Wirklichkeit im "Hirten des Hermas"* (FRLANT, 150), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989, pp. 192–214.
- Liettaert Peerbolte, B.J., *To Worship the Beast: The Revelation of John and the Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, in M. Labahn and J. Zangenberg (eds.), *Zwischen den Reichen. Neues Testament und Römische Herrschaft. Vorträge auf der Ersten Konferenz der European Association for Biblical Studies* (TANZ, 36), Tübingen – Basel, Francke, 2002, pp. 239–259.
- Lietzmann, H., *Messe und Herrenmahl. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Liturgie* (AKG, 8), Bonn, Marcus und Weber, 1926.
- , *Zur altchristlichen Verfassungsgeschichte*, in ZWTh 55 (1914) 97–153; repr. in K. Aland (ed.), *Hans Lietzmann. Kleine Schriften. 1. Studien zur spätantiken Religionsgeschichte* (TU, 67 = 5.12), Berlin, Akademie, 1958, pp. 141–185.
- Lightfoot, J.B., *The Apostolic Fathers. I. S. Clement of Rome*, London, Macmillan, 1890².
- Lindemann, A., *Die Clemensbriefe* (HNT, 17; Die Apostolischen Väter, 1), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1992.
- , *Kinder in der Welt der Antike als Thema gegenwärtiger Forschung*, in ThR 76 (2011) 82–111.
- Link, A., *Die Einheit des Pastor Hermae*, Marburg, Elwert, 1888.

- Lipsius, R.A., *Der Hirte des Hermas und der Montanismus in Rom*, in *ZWTh* 8 (1865) 266–308.
- Lisco, H., *Roma Peregrina. Ein Überblick über die Entwicklung des Christentums in den ersten Jahrhunderten*, Berlin, Schneider – Klinsmann, 1901.
- Lluis-Font, P., *Sources de la doctrine d'Hermas sur les deux esprits*, in *RAM* 39 (1963) 83–98.
- Löhr, H., *Umkehr und Sünde im Hebräerbrief* (BZNW, 73), Berlin, de Gruyter, 1994.
- Lohse, E., *Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments* (ThW, 4), Stuttgart – Berlin – Köln, Kohlhammer, 2001⁶.
- Lona, H.E., *Über die Auferstehung des Fleisches. Studien zur frühchristlichen Eschatologie* (BZNW, 66), Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 1993.
- Lucchesi, E., *Le Pasteur d'Hermas en copte: Perspective nouvelle*, in *VigChr* 43 (1989) 393–396.
- Luomanen, P., *Recovering Jewish-Christian Sects and Gospels* (SVigChr, 110), Leiden, Brill, 2012.
- Luschnat, O., *Die Jungfrauenszene in der Arkadienvision des Hermas*, in *ThViat* 12 (1973–1974) 53–70.
- Lusini, G., *Nouvelles recherches sur le texte du Pasteur d'Hermas*, in *Apocrypha* 12 (2001) 79–97.
- Luttikhuisen, G.P., *The Revelation of Elchasai: Investigations into the Evidence for a Mesopotamian Jewish Apocalypse of the Second Century and Its Reception by Judeo-Christian Propagandists* (TSAJ, 8), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1985.
- , *Elchasaites and their Book*, in A. Marjanen and P. Luomanen (eds.), *A Companion to Second-Century Christian 'Heretics'* (SVigChr, 76), Leiden, Brill, 2008, pp. 335–364.
- MacDonald, M.Y., *Early Christian Women and Pagan Opinion: The Power of Hysterical Women*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- , *Was Celsus Right? The Role of Women in the Expansion of Early Christianity*, in D.L. Balch and C. Osiek (eds.), *Early Christian Families in Context: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue* (Religion, Marriage, and Family), Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, U.K., Eerdmans, 2003, pp. 157–184.
- , *Reading Real Women through the Undisputed Letters of Paul*, in R.S. Kraemer and M.R. D'Angelo (eds.), *Women & Christian Origins*, New York – Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 199–220.
- , *Rereading Paul: Early Interpreters of Paul on Women and Gender*, in R.S. Kraemer and M.R. D'Angelo (eds.), *Women & Christian Origins*, New York – Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 236–253.
- Mackenzie, F.S., 'Letter to K. Lake', quoted in K. Lake, *Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity* (The Beginnings of Christianity), London, MacMillan, 1920, pp. 137–140.

- Madigan, K. and Osiek, C. (eds.), *Ordained Women in the Early Church: A Documented History*, Baltimore, MD – London, Johns Hopkins University Press, 2005.
- Maier, H.O., *The Social Setting of the Ministry as Reflected in the Writings of Hermas, Clement and Ignatius* (Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion Dissertation Series, 1), Waterloo, ON, Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1991.
- , *From Material Place to Imagined Space: Emergent Christian Community as Thirdspace in the Shepherd of Hermas*, in M. Grundeken and J. Verheyden (eds.), *Early Christian Communities between Ideal and Reality* (WUNT, 342), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2015, pp. 143–160.
- Manns, F., *L'Israël de Dieu. Essais sur le christianisme primitif* (SBFA, 42), Jerusalem, Franciscan Printing Press, 1996.
- , *Le judéo-christianisme, mémoire ou prophétie?* (ThH, 112), Paris, Beauchesne, 2000.
- Martin, J.P., *Espíritu y dualismo de espíritus en el Pastor de Hermas y su relación con el judaísmo*, in *VetChr* 15 (1978) 295–345.
- Martin, R.P., *Worship in the Early Church*, Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans, 1975.
- Mastin, B.A., *The Imperial Cult and the Ascription of the Title Θεός to Jesus* (John xx.28), in *StEv* 6 = TU 112 (1979) 352–365.
- Mauer, J. auf der, *Die Gnade tanzt. Das Tanzritual der apokryphen Johannesakten und seine Bedeutung*, in E. Gössmann and G. Zobel (eds.), *Das Gold im Wachs. FS für Thomas Immoos zum 70. Geburtstag*, München, Iudicium, 1988, pp. 108–145.
- McGowan, A., *Rethinking Agape and Eucharist in Early North African Christianity*, in *StLi* 34 (2004) 165–176.
- McGuire, M.B., *Religion: The Social Context*, Belmont, CA, Wadsworth, 2002⁵.
- Meeks, W.A., *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (NT.S, 14), Leiden, Brill, 1967.
- , *The Origins of Christian Morality: The First Two Centuries*, New Haven, CT, Yale University Press, 1993.
- , *Social and Ecclesial Life of the Earliest Christians*, in F.M. Young and M.M. Mitchell (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Christianity. 1. Origins to Constantine*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006, pp. 145–173.
- Meggitt, J., *The First Churches: Religious Practice*, in J. Barton, *The Biblical World*. 11, London – New York, Routledge, 2002.
- Meiser, M., *Lukas und die römische Staatsmacht*, in M. Labahn and J. Zangenberg (eds.), *Zwischen den Reichen. Neues Testament und Römische Herrschaft. Vorträge auf der Ersten Konferenz der European Association for Biblical Studies* (TANZ, 36), Tübingen – Basel, Francke, 2002, pp. 175–193.
- , *Das Christentum in Rom im Spiegel des Ersten Clemensbriefes*, in J. Zangenberg and M. Labahn (eds.), *Christians as a Religious Minority in a Multicultural City: Modes of Interaction and Identity Formation in Early Imperial Rome. Studies on the*

- Basis of a Seminar at the Second Conference of the European Association for Biblical Studies (EABS) from July 8–12, 2001, in Rome* (JSNTS, 243), London – New York, T&T Clark, 2004, pp. 139–156.
- Menken, M.J.J., *1, 2 en 3 Johannes. Een praktische bijbelverklaring* (Tekst en toelichting), Kampen, Kok, 2010.
- Michaelis, W., *Zur Engelchristologie im Urchristentum. Abbau der Konstruktion Martin Werners* (GBTh, 1), Basel, Majer, 1942.
- Miller, P. (Cox), “*All the Words Were Frightful*”: *Salvation by Dreams in the Shepherd of Hermas*, in *VigChr* 42 (1988) 327–338.
- , *Dreams in Late Antiquity: Studies in the Imagination of a Culture*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Mimouni, S.C., *Pour une définition nouvelle du judéo-christianisme ancien*, in *NTS* 38 (1992) 161–186.
- , *Le judéo-christianisme ancien. Essais historiques*, Paris, Cerf, 1998.
- Moeller, B., *Geschichte des Christentums in Grundzügen* (UTB, 905), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992⁵.
- Moss, C.R., *Ancient Christian Martyrdom: Diverse Practices, Theologies, and Traditions* (AYBRL), New Haven – London, Yale University Press, 2012.
- Moxnes, H., *God and His Angel in the Shepherd of Hermas*, in *StTh* 28 (1974) 49–56.
- Moyo, A., *Angels and Christology in the Shepherd of Hermas* (PhD thesis, Harvard University, 1978).
- Muddiman, J., *The Church in Ephesians, 2 Clement, and the Shepherd of Hermas*, in A.F. Gregory and C.M. Tuckett (eds.), *Trajectories through the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005, pp. 107–121.
- Mullen, R.L., *The Expansion of Christianity: A Gazetteer of Its First Three Centuries* (SVigChr, 69), Leiden, Brill, 2004.
- Muller, E., *A Distinctive Feature of Early Roman Angelomorphic Christology*, in *StPatr* 45 (2010) 285–290.
- Nanos, M.D., *The Jewish Context of the Gentile Audience Addressed in Paul's Letter to the Romans*, in *CBQ* 61 (1999) 283–304.
- Nash, R.S., *1 Corinthians* (Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary), Macon, GA, Smyth & Helwys, 2009.
- Nautin, P., *Erma (Pastore)*, in *DPAC* 1 (1983) 1197–1198.
- Nickselsburg, G.W.E., *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism and Early Christianity* (HTS, 56), Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, 2006.
- Nicklas, T., *Apokryphe Passionstraditionen im Vergleich. Petrus-evangelium und Sibyllinische Orakel (Buch VIII)*, in T.J. Kraus and T. Nicklas (eds.), *Das Evangelium nach Petrus. Text, Kontexte, Intertexte* (TU, 158), Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 2007, pp. 263–279.

- Nicklas, T., Reiterer, F.V. and Verheyden, J. (eds.), in Collaboration with H. Braun, *The Human Body in Death and Resurrection* (DCL.Y), Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 2009.
- Niederwimmer, K., *Die Didache* (KAV, 1), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
- Nijendijk, L.W., *Die Christologie des Hirten des Hermas exegetisch, religions- und dogmengeschichtlich untersucht* (PhD thesis, University of Utrecht, 1986).
- Opitz, H., *Ursprünge frühkatholischer Pneumatologie. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehung der Lehre vom Heiligen Geist in der römischen Gemeinde unter Zugrundelegung des 1. Clemensbriefes und des "Hirten" des Hermas*, Berlin, Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1960.
- Osborn, E., *Geleitwort*, in A. Schneider, "Propter sanctam ecclesiam suam." *Die Kirche als Geschöpf, Frau und Bau im Bußunterricht des Pastor Hermas* (SEAug, 67), Rome, Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1999, p. 7.
- Osiek, C., *The Ransom of Captives: Evolution of a Tradition*, in *HTR* 74 (1981) 365–386.
- , *Rich and Poor in the Shepherd of Hermas: An Exegetical-Social Investigation* (CBQMS, 15), Washington, DC, Catholic Biblical Association, 1983.
- , *The Genre and Function of the Shepherd of Hermas*, in A.Y. Collins (ed.), *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting* (Semeia, 36), Decatur, GA, Scholars Press, 1986, pp. 113–121.
- , *The Second Century through the Eyes of Hermas: Continuity and Change*, in *BTB* 20 (1990) 116–122.
- Osiek, C. and Balch, D.L., *Families in the New Testament World: Households and House Churches* (The Family, Religion, and Culture), Louisville, KY, Westminster John Knox, 1997.
- Osiek, C., *The Oral World of Early Christianity in Rome: The Case of Hermas*, in K.P. Donfried and P. Richardson (eds.), *Judaism and Christianity in First-Century Rome*, Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, Eerdmans, 1998, pp. 151–172.
- , *Shepherd of Hermas: A Commentary* (Hermeneia), Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 1999.
- , *The New Testament Teaching of Family Matters*, in *HTS* 62(3) (2006) 819–843.
- Osiek, C., MacDonald, M.Y. and Tulloch, J.H., *A Woman's Place: House Churches in Earliest Christianity*, Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 2006.
- Paramelle, J. and Adnès, P., *Hermas*, in *DSp* 7 (1969) 316–334.
- Parkin, T.G. and Pomeroy, A.J., *Roman Social History: A Sourcebook* (Routledge Sourcebooks for the Ancient World), London – New York, Routledge, 2007.
- Parsons, P., *Letter to B.M. Metzger (28 October 1985)*, partly quoted in B. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1987, p. 63 n. 36.
- Penn, M.P., *Kissing Christians: Ritual and Community in the Late Ancient Church* (Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion), Philadelphia, PA, University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005.

- Pernveden, L., *The Concept of the Church in the Shepherd of Hermas* (STL, 27), Lund, Gleerup, 1966.
- Perrot, C., *The Reading of the Bible in the Ancient Synagogue*, in M.J. Mulder and H. Sysling (eds.), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (CRINT, 2/1), Assen – Maastricht, Van Gorcum; Philadelphia, PA, Fortress, 1988.
- Pesch, R., *Das Markusevangelium. II. Kommentar zu Kap. 8,27–16,20* (HThK, 2), Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 1977.
- Peterson, E., *Kritische Analyse der fünften Vision des Hermas*, in *HJ* 77 (1958) 362–369; rev. in Id., *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis*, Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 1959, pp. 271–284.
- , *Die Begegnung mit dem Ungeheuer. Hermas, Visio IV*, in *VigChr* 8 (1954) 52–71; rev. in Id., *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis*, Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 1959, pp. 285–309.
- , *Giudaismo e Cristianesimo: culto giudaico e culto cristiano*, in *RSLR* 1 (1965) 367–391.
- Phillips, L.E., *The Ritual Kiss in Early Christian Worship* (JLS, 36), Cambridge, Grove Books, 1996.
- Piana, G. la, *The Roman Church at the End of the Second Century*, in *HTR* 18 (1925) 201–277.
- Plooij, D., *Eine enkratitische Glosse im Diatessaron. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Askese in der alten Kirche*, in *ZNW* 22 (1923) 1–16.
- Plümacher, E., *Identitätsverlust und Identitätsgewinn. Studien zum Verhältnis von kaiserzeitlicher Stadt und frühem Christentum* (BThSt, 11), Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1987.
- Poschmann, B., *Paenitentia secunda. Die kirchliche Buße im ältesten Christentum bis Cyprian und Origenes* (Theoph., 1), Bonn, Hanstein, 1940.
- Puech, A., *Histoire de la littérature grecque chrétienne. II*, Paris, Société d'édition 'les belles lettres', 1928.
- Rahner, K., *Schriften zur Theologie. XI. Frühe Bußgeschichte in Einzeluntersuchungen*, Zürich – Einsiedeln – Köln, Benziger, 1973.
- , *The Penitential Teaching of the Shepherd of Hermas*, in *Theological Investigations* 15 (1982) 57–113.
- Ratzinger, J., *Der Geist der Liturgie. Eine Einführung*, Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 2000.
- Regev, E., *Atonement and Sectarianism in Qumran: Defining a Sectarian Worldview in Moral and Halakhic Systems*, in D.J. Chalcroft (ed.), *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (BWo), London – Oakville, Equinox, 2007, pp. 180–204.
- Reid, B.E., *Prophetic Voices of Elizabeth, Mary, and Anna in Luke 1–2*, in J. Corley (ed.), *New Perspectives on the Nativity*, London – New York, T&T Clark, 2009, pp. 37–46.

- Reiling, J., *Hermas and Christian Prophecy: A Study of the Eleventh Mandate* (NT.S, 37), Leiden, Brill, 1973.
- Richey, L.B., *Roman Imperial Ideology and the Gospel of John* (CBQMS, 43), Washington, DC, Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2007.
- Rife, J.M., *Hermas and the Shepherd*, in *ClW* 37 (1943) 81.
- Ritter, A.M., "Kirche und Staat" im Denken des frühen Christentums. Texte und Kommentare zum Thema Religion und Politik in der Antike (TC, 13), Bern, Peter Lang, 2005.
- Robinson, D.C., *The Problem of Διψυχία in the Shepherd of Hermas*, in *StPatr* 45 (2010) 303–308.
- Rordorf, W., *Un chapitre d'éthique judeo-chrétienne. Les deux voies*, in *RSR* 60 (1972) 109–128.
- Rouwhorst, G.A.M., *The Reading of Scripture in Early Christian Liturgy*, in L.V. Rutgers (ed.), *What Athens Has to Do with Jerusalem: Essays on Classical, Jewish, and Early Christian Art and Archaeology in Honor of Gideon Foerster* (ISACR, 1), Leuven, Peeters, 2002, pp. 305–331.
- Rowland, C., *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*, London, SPCK, 1982.
- Rüpke, J., *Apokalyptische Salzberge. Zum sozialen Ort und zur literarischen Strategie des 'Hirten des Hermas'*, in *ARELG* 1 (1999) 148–160.
- Rüpke, J., *Der Hirte des Hermas. Plausibilisierungs- und Legitimierungsstrategien im Übergang von Antike und Christentum*, in *ZAC* 8 (2005) 276–298.
- Salzmann, J.C., *Pliny (ep. 10,96) and Christian Liturgy—A Reconsideration*, in *StPatr* 20 (1989) 389–395.
- , *Lehren und Ermahnen. Zur Geschichte des christlichen Wortgottesdienstes in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (WUNT 11, 59), Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- Sandnes, K.O., *Seal and Baptism in Early Christianity*, in D. Hellholm, T. Vegge, Ø. Norderval and C. Hellholm (eds.), *Ablution, Initiation, and Baptism. Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity / Waschungen, Initiation und Taufe. Spätantike, Frühes Judentum und Frühes Christentum*. 11 (BZNW, 176), Berlin, de Gruyter, 2011, pp. 1441–1481.
- Sandt, H. van de, *James 4,1–4 in the Light of the Jewish Two Ways Tradition 3,1–6*, in *Bib.* 88 (2007) 38–63.
- Schäfer, W., *Frühchristlicher Widerstand*, in W. Haase (ed.), *Principat. Religion (vorkonstantinisches Christentum: Verhältnis zu römischem Staat und heidnischer Religion)* (ANRW, 2.23.1), Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 1979, pp. 460–723.
- Schmitt, T., *Paroikie und Oikoumene. Sozial- und mentalitätsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum 1. Clemensbrief* (BZNW, 110), Berlin, de Gruyter, 2002.
- Schnackenburg, R., *Gottes Herrschaft und Reich. Eine biblisch-theologische Studie*, Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 1959.

- Schneider, A., "Propter sanctam ecclesiam suam." *Die Kirche als Geschöpf, Frau und Bau im Bußunterricht des Pastor Hermae* (SEAug, 67), Rome, Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 1999.
- Schrage, W., *Ethik des Neuen Testaments* (GNT, 4), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982⁴.
- , *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. III. 1Kor 11,17–14,40 (EKK, 7), Zürich – Düsseldorf, Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn, Neukirchener, 1999.
- Schröter, J., *Jesus Tradition in Matthew, James, and the Didache: Searching for Characteristic Emphases*, in H. van de Sandt and J.K. Zangenber (eds.), *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings* (SBLSymS, 45), Atlanta, GA, Society of Biblical Literature, 2008, pp. 233–255.
- Schulz, S., *Die Mitte der Schrift. Der Frühkatholizismus im Neuen Testament als Herausforderung an den Protestantismus*, Stuttgart – Berlin, Kreuz, 1976.
- Schweitzer, V., *Der Pastor Hermae und die opera supererogatoria*, in *ThQ* 86 (1904) 539–556.
- Seitz, O.J.F., *Antecedents and Signification of the Term Ἀΐψυχος*, in *JBL* 66 (1947) 211–219.
- Setzer, C., *Resurrection of the Body in Early Judaism and Early Christianity: Doctrine, Community, and Self-Definition*, Leiden – Boston, MA, Brill, 2004.
- Sherwin-White, A.N., *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1966.
- Sittl, C., *Die Gebärden der Griechen und Römer*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1890; repr. Hildesheim – New York, Olms, 1970.
- Skarsaune, O. and Hvalvik, R. (eds.), *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries*, Peabody, MA, Hendrickson, 2007.
- Skarsaune, O., *Jewish Believers in Jesus in Antiquity: Problems of Definition, Method, and Sources*, in O. Skarsaune and R. Hvalvik (eds.), *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries*, Peabody, MA, Hendrickson, 2007, pp. 3–21.
- , *Jewish Christian Sources Used by Justin Martyr and Some Other Greek and Latin Fathers*, in O. Skarsaune and R. Hvalvik (eds.), *Jewish Believers in Jesus: The Early Centuries*, Peabody, MA, Hendrickson, 2007, pp. 379–416.
- Skeris, R.A., *Musical Imagery in the Ecclesiastical Writers of the First Three Centuries* (PhD thesis, University of Bonn, 1976).
- Smith, M.M., *Feminine Images in the Shepherd of Hermas* (PhD thesis, Duke University, 1979).
- Snyder, G., *The Shepherd of Hermas* (ApF[T], 6), Camden, NJ, Nelson, 1969.
- Sommer, W. and Klahr, D., *Kirchengeschichtliches Repetitorium. Zwanzig Grundkapitel der Kirchen-, Dogmen- und Theologiegeschichte* (UTB, 1796), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002³.
- Sorge-Møller, V., "With What Kind of Body Will They Come?." *Metamorphosis and the Concept of Change: From Platonic Thinking to Paul's Notion of the Resurrection of the Dead*, in T.K. Seim and J. Økland (eds.), *Metamorphoses: Resurrection, Body and*

- Transformative Practices in Early Christianity* (Ekstasis, 1), Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 2009, pp. 109–122.
- Spitta, F., *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums*. 11. *Der Brief des Jakobus. Studien zum Hirten des Hermas*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896.
- Staats, R., *Hermas*, in *TRE* 15 (1986) 100–108.
- Stahl, A., *Patristische Untersuchungen. Der "Hirt" des Hermas*, Leipzig, Deichert, 1901.
- Stark, R. and Bainbridge, W.S., *The Future of Religion: Secularization, Revival and Cult Formation*, Berkeley, CA – Los Angeles, CA – London, University of California Press, 1985.
- Streeter, B.H., *The Primitive Church*, London, Macmillan, 1929.
- Ström, A. von, *Der Hirt des Hermas: Allegorie oder Wirklichkeit?* (AMNSU, 3), Uppsala, Wretmans, 1936.
- Suggs, M.J., *The Christian Two Ways Tradition: Its Antiquity, Form, and Function*, in D.E. Aune (ed.), *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature. Essays in Honor of Allen P. Wikgren* (NT.S, 33), Leiden, Brill, 1972, pp. 60–74.
- Sundberg, A.C., *Canon Muratori: A Fourth Century List*, in *HTR* 66 (1973) 1–41.
- Syreeni, K., *The Sermon on the Mount and the Two Ways Teaching of the Didache*, in H. van de Sandt (ed.), *Matthew and the Didache: Two Documents from the Same Jewish-Christian Milieu?*, Assen, Van Gorcum; Minneapolis, MN, Fortress, 2005, pp. 87–103.
- Taylor, C. *The Two Ways in Hermas and Xenophon*, in *JP* 21 (1893) 243–258.
- , *The Shepherd of Hermas*. I. London, SPCK, 1903.
- Taylor, J.E., *Christians and the Holy Places: The Myth of Jewish-Christian Origins*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1993.
- Thiersch, H.W., *Die Kirche im apostolischen Zeitalter*, Frankfurt am Main, Herder – Zimmer, 1852.
- Thomassen, E., *Valentinian Ideas About Salvation as Transformation*, in T.K. Seim and J. Økland (eds.), *Metamorphoses: Resurrection, Body and Transformative Practices in Early Christianity* (Ekstasis, 1), Berlin – New York, de Gruyter, 2009, pp. 169–186.
- Thompson, J.D. and Baird, J.A., *A Critical Concordance to the Shepherd of Hermas*. 4 vols. (CompBib, 50), Wooster, OH, Biblical Research Associates, 1998.
- Thorsteinsson, R.M., *Roman Christianity and Roman Stoicism: A Comparative Study of Ancient Morality*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Thurén, L., *Jeremiah 27 and Civil Obedience in 1 Peter*, in M. Labahn and J. Zangenberg (eds.), *Zwischen den Reichen. Neues Testament und Römische Herrschaft. Vorträge auf der Ersten Konferenz der European Association for Biblical Studies* (TANZ, 36), Tübingen – Basel, Francke, 2002, pp. 215–228.
- Torjesen, K.J., *When Women Were Priests: Women's Leadership in the Early Church and the Scandal of Their Subordination in the Rise of Christianity*, New York, Harper San Francisco, 1995.

- Tuckett, C.M., *Matthew: The Social and Historical Context – Jewish Christian and/or Gentile?*, in D. Senior (ed.), *The Gospel of Matthew at the Crossroads of Early Christianity* (BETL, 243), Leuven, Peeters, 2011, pp. 99–129.
- Turmel, J., *Le pasteur d'Hermas*, in *APhC* 148 (1904) 26–52.
- Unnik, W.C. van, *Zur Bedeutung von ταπεινοῦν τὴν ψυχὴν bei den Apostolischen Vätern*, in *ZNW* 44 (1952–1953) 250–255.
- , *A Note on the Dance of Jesus in the Acts of John*, in Id., *Sparsa Collecta*. III (NT.S, 31), Leiden, Brill, 1983, pp. 144–147.
- Verheyden, J., *The Canon Muratori: A Matter of Dispute*, in J.-M. Auwers and H.J. de Jonge (eds.), *The Biblical Canons* (BETL, 163), Leuven, Peeters, 2003, pp. 487–556.
- , *The Shepherd of Hermas and the Writings that Later Formed the New Testament*, in A.F. Gregory and C.M. Tuckett (eds.), *The Reception of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005, pp. 293–329.
- , *Jewish Christianity, A State of Affairs: Affinities and Differences with Respect to Matthew, James, and the Didache*, in H. van de Sandt and J.K. Zangenbergh (eds.), *Matthew, James, and Didache: Three Related Documents in Their Jewish and Christian Settings* (SBLSymS, 45), Atlanta, GA, Society of Biblical Literature, 2008, pp. 123–135.
- Verweij, P.G., *Evangelium und neues Gesetz in der ältesten Christenheit bis auf Marcion* (STRT, 5), Utrecht, Kemink, 1960.
- Völter, D., *Die apostolischen Väter neu untersucht*. 1. Clemens, Hermas, Barnabas, Leiden, Brill, 1904.
- Volz, P., *Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba*, Tübingen – Leipzig, Mohr Siebeck, 1903; second edition: *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1934.
- Wansink, C.S., *“You Will Be Restored Again to Your Office”: Autobiographical Insights in The Shepherd of Hermas*, in A. Özen (ed.), *Historische Wahrheit und theologische Wissenschaft. Gerd Lüdemann zum 50. Geburtstag*, Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang, 1996, pp. 71–85.
- Wassen, C. and Jokiranta, J., *Groups in Tension: Sectarianism in the Damascus Document and the Community Rule*, in D.J. Chalcrafft (ed.), *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (BWo), London – Oakville, Equinox, 2007, pp. 205–245.
- Weaver, P.R.C., *Children of Freedmen (and Freedwomen)*, in B. Rawson (ed.), *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome*, Canberra, Humanities Research Centre; Oxford, Clarendon, 1991, pp. 166–190.
- Wehofer, T.M., *Die Genesis eines judenchristlichen Prophetenbuches (Hermas). Untersuchungen zur altchristlichen Epistolographie*, in *SAWW.PH* 143/17 (1901) 43–56.
- Weinel, H., *Der Hirt des Hermas*, in E. Hennecke (ed.), *Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1914², pp. 290–323.

- Werner, M.S., *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas problemgeschichtlich dargestellt*, Bern, Haupt; Tübingen, Katzmann, 1941; rev. and trans. by S.G.F. Brandon as *The Formation of Christian Dogma: An Historical Study of Its Problem*, London, Black, 1957.
- White, J.C., *The Interaction of Language and World in the Shepherd of Hermas* (PhD thesis, Temple University, 1973).
- Whittaker, M., *Hermas, Shepherd of*, in *NCE* 6 (1967) 1074–1075.
- Wilson, B.R., *Introduction*, in Id. (ed.), *Patterns of Sectarianism: Organization and Ideology in Social and Religious Movements*, London, Heinemann, 1967, pp. 1–21.
- , *An Analysis of Sect Development*, in Id. (ed.), *Patterns of Sectarianism: Organization and Ideology in Social and Religious Movements*, London, Heinemann, 1967, pp. 22–45.
- , *Religious Sects: A Sociological Study* (World University Library), London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1970.
- , *Magic and the Millennium: A Sociological Study of Religious Movements of Protest among Tribal and Third-World Peoples*, London, Heinemann, 1973.
- , *The Social Dimensions of Sectarianism: Sects and New Religious Movements in Contemporary Society*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1990.
- Wilson, J.C., *Toward a Reassessment of the Shepherd of Hermas: Its Date and Its Pneumatology*, Lewiston, NY – Queenston, ON – Lampeter, Mellen, 1993.
- , *Five Problems in the Interpretation of the Shepherd of Hermas: Authorship, Genre, Canonicity, Apocalyptic, and the Absence of the Name 'Jesus Christ'* (Mellen Biblical Press Series, 34), Lewiston, NY – Queenston, ON – Lampeter, Mellen, 1995.
- Wilson, W.J., *The Career of the Prophet Hermas*, in *HTR* 20 (1927) 21–62.
- Winter, B.W., *Roman Wives, Roman Widows: The Appearance of New Women and the Pauline Communities*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge, 2003.
- Young, F., *Christian Teaching*, in F. Young, L. Ayres and A. Louth (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004, pp. 91–104.
- Young, N.H., 'The Use of Sunday for Meetings of Believers in the New Testament': A Response, in *NovT* 45 (2003) 111–122.
- Young, S., *Being a Man: The Pursuit of Manliness in the Shepherd of Hermas*, in *J ECS* 2 (1994) 237–255.
- Zahn, T., *Der Hirt des Hermas*, Gotha, Perthes, 1868.
- , *Antwort auf des Herrn Professor Dr. Lipsius Beleuchtung der Polemik eines Apologeten*, in *JDT* 15 (1870) 192–206.
- , *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur*. III, Erlangen – Leipzig, Deichert, 1884.

Index of Ancient Sources

1 Old Testament

Genesis	125n48
26:8 LXX	176n21
Exodus	
4:16	64n48
Deuteronomy	49n132
2 Samuel	
28:13	64n48
1 Kings	
18:26	164n15
2 Kings	
2	63
Psalms	
18:9 LXX	49n132
138:1	64n48
149:1 LXX	164n15
149:3 LXX	164n15
Proverbs	
6:30 LXX	124n41
Jeremiah	
5:7 LXX	79n57, 96n45
Daniel	
6:23 Θ	3n8

2 Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

1 Enoch

48:2–4	37n53
--------	-------

Joseph and Aseneth

4:1	172n4
4:5	172n4
8:4–7	177n33
8:5	177n33
8:7	177n33
19:10–11	175 with n17
22:9	175

Jubilees

36:7	37n53
------	-------

Sirach	119n18
26:27	104

3 Other Jewish Literature

1QS	27n14
3:13–4:26	27n14

Hodayoth	27n14
----------	-------

Josephus

<i>Jewish Antiquities</i>	
7:284	172n4
8:387	172n4

Philo	108, 164–165 with n24
-------	--------------------------

<i>On Dreams</i>	
1:98	126–127n54

<i>On the Contemplative Life</i>	164, 165n26
64–90	164n16
64	164n19
66–82	164
66	165n22
68	165n23
80	161n5, 165n21
81	165n21
83–90	164
83	164n17, 165n21
84	161n5, 165n21.25, 168n41

85	161n5, 164, 165n21
87	165n25
89	164, 165n22.25, 168n41

<i>On the Special Laws</i>	
2:148	161n5
3:170	108n55

4 New Testament

		15:23	166
		15:25	166
Matthew	18n67, 94n39,	16:22–31	65
	118–119n18	19:37	172
5:32	103n28	20:25	88
5:42	118n18	20:46	77n49,
13:19–20	74n33		144n25–26,
13:22–23	74n33		151
19:9	103n28	22:47–48	172n4
21:8	172	23:26	99n3
22:21	88		
23:6	77n49,	John	94n39
	144n25–26, 151	5:24	74n33
26:49	172n4	10:35	64n48
27:52–53	65	14:24	74n33
		18:36	88
Mark	8n36, 94n39,		
	166	Acts	118n18
1:39	27n15	1:11	63n44
4:15–16	74n33	4:4	74n33
4:18	74n33	9:43	99n3
4:20	74n33	10:5	99n3
6:21	166	10:6	99n3
9:15	172	10:44	74n33
10:38–41	91n26	12:13	98n3
11:8	172	13:7	74n33
12:17	88	13:44	74n33
12:39	77n49,	15:7	74n33
	144n25–26, 151	15:31	31n29
14:22–26	166	19:10	74n33
14:26	160n5	19:14	99n3
14:45	172n4	19:24	99n3
15:21	99n3	20:7–11	166
16:19	63n44	20:35	118n18
		21:16	99n3
Luke	94n39,	22:12	99n3
	118–119n18,	24:1	99n3
	166, 178	25:8	93n30
5:1	74n33	25:19	99n3
6:30	118n18		
7:38	174	Romans	8n36
7:45	172n4, 174,	15:25	153n9
	178n38	15:26	153n9
8:11–15	74n33	15:28	153n9
8:21	74n33	15:31	153n9
11:28	74n33	16:14	3, 4 with n13,
11:43	144n25		6, 12n47, 13
15:20	172n4, 175	16:16	171n1, 172n4

1 Corinthians	30n25, 145n33	Colossians	
1:18	67n60	3:16	160n5
7:10–11	103n28	4:16	31n29
7:39–40	103n28		
11	151n57	1 Thessalonians	94n39
11:17–34	145, 151, 182	2:9	60n25
11:18	146	5:26	171n1, 172n4
11:19	146	5:27	31n29
11:20	148n39		
11:21–22	147, 151n57	2 Thessalonians	
11:21	146–147, 151n57	3:8	60n25
11:22	146–147		
11:27	146	1 Timothy	
11:29	147, 151n57	4:13	30
11:30	146, 151n57		
11:31–32	147	Titus	88
11:32	147, 151n57	3:1	88
11:34	147, 151n57		
14:15	160n5	Hebrews	134n23
14:26	160n5	6:4–6	134n23
14:34–35	104	10:26	134n23
15:12	58	12:17	134n23
15:50	58, 65		
16:1–3	153n9	James	
16:1–2	153n9	1:22–23	74n33
16:3	153n9	5:13	160n5
16:20	171n1, 172n4		
		1 Peter	8n36, 88, 89n19
2 Corinthians		2–3	88
2:15	67n60	2:17	112n81
5:1	65	3:19	66n52
7:19	153n9	4:6	66n52
8:4	153n9	5:9	112n81
8:6	153n9	5:14	172n4
8:20	153n9		
9:1	153n9	2 Peter	
9:11	153n9	2:8	135n30
9:13	153n9		
13:12	171n1, 172n4		
		1 John	
Ephesians		2:7	74n33
1:13	74n33		
4:4	132n17	2 John	
5:18–19	160n5	1	46n121, 106n41
Philippians		Jude	
2:9–10	43n101	12	148n40

Revelation	90 with n22–23, 96n48	2:4 38:2	112n81 122n31
1:3	31n29	60–61	89n17
1:10–11	31n29	60:2–61:2	89n17
8:3	46n121	65:1	31n29
22:18	31n29		
5 Other Early Christian Literature		2 <i>Clement</i>	130n13
		9:1	58
		14:1	46n121
		14:2	106n41
<i>Acts of John</i>	166 with n30, 167n33–34, 168n41, 169n43	Clement of Alexandria	6, 16, 176
62	172n4	<i>Pedagogue</i>	
89	172n6	2:43,1	160n5
94–97	166	2:43,3	160n5
94	166, 167n31	3:81	177n28
95	166, 167 with n31, 168n41	44:1	160n5
96	167n31	44:3–4	160n5
97	167n31		
Antiochos (Ant)	120n21	Cyprian	150
		<i>Epistles</i>	
		63:16,1	150n54
<i>Apostolic Constitutions</i>	176, 179	<i>Didache</i>	24n1, 33n36, 85n1, 118n18, 119n18–19, 148–149 117n13, 118n18
2:57,17	176n27	1:5	148
8:11,9	176n27	9–10	148
		9	148
<i>Ascension of Isaiah</i>	24n1	10	148
		10:1	148n41
Athanasius of Alexandria	15	13:4	158n27
<i>Festal Letters</i>			
11	15n58	<i>Didascalia</i>	118n18
(Pseudo-)Athanasius (Ath)	120n21	2:25	152n6, 158n26
Athenagoras	176, 179	<i>ad Diognetum</i>	85n1
<i>A Plea for the Christians</i>			
32:2	176n25	Epiphanius	
<i>Barnabas</i>	24n1, 33n36	<i>Panarion</i>	67n60
		31:7,6–7	
<i>Canon Muratori</i>	3 with n9, 5 with n19–21, 6 with n24, 7n27–28, 11, 13	Eusebius of Caesarea	3, 4n13, 5–6
		<i>Ecclesiastical History</i>	
1 <i>Clement</i>	2n6, 4, 24n1, 31n29, 85n1, 122n31	2:17,18	165n26
		3:3,6	4n13
		3:15	4

Eusebius of Caesarea (cont.)		1:2,1	99n8, 169n46
4:10–11	20n77	1:2,2–1:4,3	104n35
4:11,6	3n10	1:2,3–4	169n46
4:23,1	31n29	1:2,4	33n38, 55n8,
4:23,10	31n29, 158n28		75n36, 99n8
4:23,11	31n29	1:3,1–2	70n5, 72n17–18
		1:3,1	72n17, 79n60,
<i>Gospel of Peter</i>			107n50, 112,
10:40	172n6		114n4, 169n45
40	61n34, 172 with n6	1:3,2	75n36, 107n52,
			112, 137n35
41	66n52	1:3,4	48n32,
			75n35–36, 84,
Hermas			91n27, 94 with
<i>Visions</i>	1, 12n47, 14, 16		n40, 97,
1– <i>Sim.</i> 8	12n47		180–181
1– <i>Sim.</i> 7	13n47	1:4,2	77, 91n27
1–4	11–12n46,	1:4,3	106n42
	12–13n47, 14	2:1,1	11n41
1–3	32n34	2:1,2–3	33n38
1:1–1:2	170	2:1,3–4	28n20, 31n31,
1:1,1–2	19, 104n36, 112		73n26, 108n56
1:1,1	10n38, 11n41,	2:1,3	74n31, 75n36,
	16n65, 27, 71n7,		104n35
	95n43, 98n2–3,	2:1,4	19n71, 110n67
	99n4, 100n15,	2:2	101n16
	113, 181	2:2,1	33n38
1:1,2	11n41, 99n6–8,	2:2,2–3	70n5
	169n46	2:2,2	91n27
1:1,3–9	62n41	2:2,3–4	139n42
1:1,3–4	33n38	2:2,3	70n6, 84, 99n5,
1:1,3	10n38, 11n41		100n14, 101n16,
1:1,4–9	104n35–36		104n30, 112,
1:1,4–5	63n44, 97, 181		139n42, 169n47,
1:1,4	63n44, 64,		181
	95n43	2:2,4–5	75n36
1:1,5–9	65, 99n8	2:2,4	73n22, 137,
1:1,5	63n44, 64,		139n42
	95n43, 98n3,	2:2,5	75n36, 76n42,
	169n46		79
1:1,6	45n116, 52,	2:2,6	71n29, 31, 32n32,
	75n35		73n27, 108n57,
1:1,7	64 with n46,		144 with m8,
	71n7, 95n43, 97,		151, 181
	99n7	2:2,7	61–62, 91n27
1:1,8	65, 76 with n44,	2:2,8	38 with n69,
	84, 100n10,		39, 45n115,
	169n46, 180		91n27
1:1,9	1 with n3, 72n17,	2:3,1	70n5, 71n7,
	73n22, 75n36		72n17–18,

	76n44, 79n60,	3:2,4	129
	91n27, 99n5,	3:2,5	105n40, 111n74,
	107n50–51.53,		113
	112	3:2,6	67n66, 80n67
2:3,2	55n8, 66 with	3:2,7–9	80n68
	n57	3:2,9	129 with n6, 181
2:3,3	66n54	3:3,1–3:10,2	104n35
2:3,4	91n27, 93, 98n2	3:3,1	112n81, 136n33
2:4,1	1n4, 11n41,	3:3,3	75n36
	45n117, 46n121,	3:3,5	28n20, 40n81,
	112n81		49n133, 94n36,
2:4,2–3	104n35		97, 129, 181
2:4,2	49n132, 74n31,	3:4,1	111n74, 113
	75n36	3:4,3	40n81
2:4,3	1 with n5, 3–4,	3:5,1	7 with n30–31,
	7n28–29.31,		67n68, 68n70,
	9n37, 11n41, 13,		75n36, 80n66,
	27n15, 28n20,		141, 153n9
	30, 31n30–31,	3:5,2	40n81–82,
	32n32–33,		91n27
	49n132, 51,	3:5,3	49n132
	68n73,	3:5,4	74 with n32, 84,
	73n26–27,		93n31, 129n9,
	74n29–30, 98n2,		180
	108n56–59,	3:5,5–3:7,6	80n68
	109n61, 112–113,	3:5,5	67n63.65,
	115n5, 144 with		78n52, 80n71,
	n19, 151, 181		81n72, 84, 180
2:6,7	61n35	3:6,1	67 with n62, 75,
3	10n38, 19n72, 84,		84, 180
	133, 140, 180	3:6,2	75n36, 78 with
3:1,1	1n4, 33n38,		n51–52.54, 84,
	112n81		142n6, 180
3:1,2–3	104n35	3:6,5–6	39 with n77
3:1,2	19n72, 92n28,	3:6,5	1n1, 39 with n77,
	156n19		40 with n79,
3:1,4	1n4, 11n44,		58n18, 79n60,
	112n81		91n27, 115
3:1,6–3:2,4	104n35	3:6,6–7	78n52, 80n71,
3:1,6–7	33n38		115, 125n50–51
3:1,8–9	105n39	3:6,6	39 with n77, 116,
3:1,8	7n28, 105n39,		127, 181
	144 with n22	3:6,7	19n72, 78n52,
3:1,9–3:2,2	91n27		116
3:1,9	8n34, 40n81, 90,	3:7,1	20n77, 53n5,
	91n26, 105n39		78n54
3:2,1	40n81, 90n25,	3:7,2	80n71
	91n27		

Hermas (cont.)			
3:7,3	11n40, 40 with n82, 74, 84, 93n31, 129 with n6, 180	3:9,6-7 3:9,6 3:9,7-10	33n38 116, 147n37, 157n23, 159n31 141, 142 with n5, 143
3:7,6	67n63,65, 81n73-74	3:9,7	7n29,31, 19n72, 77, 141, 144n18, 145 with n28
3:8,3	67 with n61, 75n36	3:9,8	37n58
3:8,4	55n8, 106n42	3:9,9-10	151
3:8,7	55n8	3:9,9	141, 145-146, 150-151
3:8,8-9	75n36		145 with n29
3:8,8	67 with n61	3:9,10-11	75n36, 141, 145-147, 151 with n57
3:8,9	11n1, 58n18	3:9,10	11n74, 113 11n4
3:8,11	75n36		104n35, 115n6, 135 11n1
3:9	77, 116 with n9, 127n56, 141-142, 145, 146n35, 147, 150, 151 with n57, 156n19, 158, 182	3:10,1 3:10,3 3:10,6 3:10,9 3:11-13 3:11,3 3:13,4 4 4:1,1 4:1,2 4:1,3 4:1,5-9 4:1,5 4:1,7-8 4:1,8 4:2,1 4:2,2-4:3,6 4:2,4 4:2,5 4:3,4 4:3,5 4:3,6 4:4,1 5-Sim. 10 5-Sim. 8 5 5:1 5:2 5:5-6	139n41, 169n44 79n60 137n35, 139 91n27 11n4, 112n81 11n41, 91n27 75n35-36 92n27 11n4, 112n81 33n38 11n4, 112n81 45n15 104n35 3n8, 91n27 75n36, 91n27, 137n35 76 with n43, 78n52, 84, 180 66n54, 75n36 75n36, 91n27 91n27 12-13n47, 14 11-12n46, 13n47 11-12n46, 13n47, 15 33n38 61n29 48n32
3:9,1-10	151		
3:9,1-6	141, 142 with n5, 145		
3:9,1-2	158		
3:9,1	11n4, 116n8, 141, 150-151		
3:9,2-3	150, 159, 182		
3:9,2	33n38, 116 with n8, 127 with n56, 141-143, 146, 147n37, 150, 151 with n47, 156n19, 158, 159n31		
3:9,3	115n5, 116 with n8, 142, 146 with n35, 147, 151n57, 156n19, 159n31		
3:9,4-6	141, 150, 158		
3:9,4	116, 126, 141, 144, 146, 147n37, 150, 157n23, 159n31		
3:9,5	116, 127 with n55, 142, 146, 147 with n36, 150, 151n57, 154, 157n23, 159 with n31, 181-182		

5:5	14	4:1,6	103n23,25
5:7	139n42	4:1,7–8	71n13, 103n24, 137–138n36
<i>Mandates</i>	1, 10n38, 12–13n47, 14, 16, 32 with n34, 48n132, 56n10	4:1,7 4:1,8	103n24, 138n36 71n10, 75n36, 81, 82n76, 84, 102n22, 103n25, 137n36, 180
1– <i>Sim.</i> 8	12n46		78, 84, 96–97, 180
1–12:3,3	13n47	4:1,9	71n10, 102n22
1	10n38, 15		72n17, 138n37
1:1	15n59, 50n134	4:1,10	115n6,
1:2	48n132, 55n8, 130n11	4:1,11 4:2,2	116–117n11, 134, 136, 138
2	10n38, 118n18		135
2:3	146n34		139n42
2:4–6	116, 117n13, 118n18, 154, 159, 182	4:2,3–4 4:2,3 4:2,4	48n132, 139n42 128
2:4	33n38, 59n25, 114, 117–119, 127, 147n37, 154 with n13–14, 156n19, 158 with n30, 159 with n31, 181–182	4:3 4:3,1 4:3,2 4:3,3 4:3,4 4:3,6	20, 128–130, 133, 181 20, 128, 138n37 128, 130 75n36, 86n8, 130 86n8, 128
2:5	91n27, 117 with n15, 118, 154n14, 155, 159n31	4:3,7 4:4,2	128, 138n37 71n14, 84, 103n26, 112
2:6	117, 118 with n18, 119, 127, 153n9, 154 with n13, 181	4:4,3 4:4,4 5	66n53 48n132 10n38
2:7	48n132, 72n17, 154n13	5:1–2 5:1,2–3	62 153n9
3	10n38	5:1,3	86n8
3:2	49n132	5:1,5	153n9
3:3	118n17	5:1,7	1n3, 61n29, 73n22, 136, 137n35
3:5	49n132, 66n53, 79n60		75n36 79n60
4	10n38, 71, 102, 136n31	5:2,1–2 5:2,2	48n132
4:1,1	100n10	5:2,8	10n38, 20n79, 33n36
4:1,4–8	112	6	32
4:1,4–6	103n23		48n132, 55n8
4:1,4	103n23, 137n36	6:1	33n37
4:1,5–10	84	6:1,1	62
4:1,5–6	71n11	6:1,2	27n14
4:1,5	103n23, 153n9	6:2	
4:1,6–8	71n12	6:2,1–4	

Hermas		10:3,4	66n53
<i>Mandates</i> (cont.)		11	10n38, 20
6:2,4	75n36	11:1	20n77, 50n134,
6:2,5	77, 79n60,		53–54n5,
	145n32		75n36
6:2,6	75n36	11:2	77, 84, 180
6:2,10	48n132, 66n53	11:3	86n8
6:8,3	145n32	11:4	77, 84, 180
7	10n38	11:8	119n21, 120n22
7:1	49n132	11:9	50n134
7:2–3	86n8	11:12	144 with n24,
7:2	94n37		145
7:4–5	49n132, 65n52	11:13–14	50n134
8	10n38	11:15	19n72
8:1	55n8	11:17	86n8
8:2–3	55n8	11:18	19n72
8:2	55n8	11:19–24	3n8
8:3	120n22	12	10n38, 11n46,
8:4–5	55n8		137n35
8:4	120n22	12:1	27n14
8:6	55n8, 75n36, 119,	12:1,2–3	3n8
	154n12	12:1,2	66n55
8:8	119–120	12:1,3	75n36
8:10	33n38, 75n36, 81	12:2,1–2	75n36
	with n75, 82n75,	12:2,1	77 with n47,
	84, 91n27,		145n32
	110n70, 112n81,	12:2,2	86n8
	114n4–5, 115n5,	12:3,2	48n132
	119, 120n22,	12:3,3	153n9
	127n56, 147n37,	12:3,4–12:6,5	13n47
	154n12, 180	12:3,4	15, 48–49n132
8:11–12	120, 127	12:3,6	48n132, 67n59,
8:12	49n132, 55n8,		70n5, 72n19
	66n53, 120	12:4,2	11n, 86
9	10n38, 137n35	12:4,3–6	49n132
9:1	137n35	12:4,3–5	48n132
9:2	137n35	12:4,3	137n35
9:4	137n35	12:4,5	137n35
9:7	137n35	12:4,6–7	86n8, 87
9:9	75n36, 86n8	12:5,1–2	86n8
9:11	86n8, 94n37	12:5,2	75n36
10	10n38	12:5,3	19n72
10:1,2	11n, 75n36	12:5,4	75n36, 86n8
10:1,4–5	79n60	12:5,5	49n132
10:1,4	79, 84, 180	12:6,1–2	86n8
10:1,5	11n45	12:6,1	11n4, 137n35
10:2,3–4	137	12:6,2	72n17, 139n42
10:2,3	137	12:6,3	67
10:3,1	153n9	12:6,4	48n132, 86n8
10:3,2–3	46, 52	12:6,5	137n35

<i>Similitudes</i>			
	1, 12n47, 14–16,	2:4–9	159, 182
	32n34, 77n45,	2:4–7	121, 155, 157n23
	158	2:4	75n36, 121,
1–7	13n47		158n29, 159n31
1	35, 50n134, 76	2:5–10	181
	with n43, 86,	2:5–8	121–122, 127
	88, 89n18	2:5–7	121, 159n31
1:1–3	86	2:5	121–122, 157n20,
1:1–2	76, 86		159, 182
1:1	1n4, 75n36, 76,	2:6	155
	86–87, 121,	2:7–8	157n20
	157n23, 158	2:7	117n14, 121 with
1:2	87		n27, 122, 127
1:3–6	48n132		with n55, 155
1:3–4	86–87	2:8	122–123, 153n9,
1:3	86–87		155, 157n20.23,
1:4–6	181		159 with n31, 182
1:4–5	76, 121, 157n23,	2:9	122, 155
	158	2:10	122 with n33,
1:4	86, 87 with n14,		127, 157n20.23
	97, 121, 158	3–4	11n45
1:5–7	180	3:2–3	84, 180
1:5–6	86, 97	3:2	82n79
1:5	86–87	3:3	82n79
1:6	76, 86, 87 with	4	66
	n10, 123n36	4:2	66, 75n36
1:7	75n36	4:3	153n9
1:8–9	76, 121, 156n18,	4:4	67, 75 with
	158		n39.41
1:8	49n132, 76,	4:5–7	79n60
	91n27, 114n5, 121,	4:5	153n9
	127 with n56,	4:6	75n36
	156n18, 157n23,	4:8	153n9
	158, 159 with	5:1,1–5	33n38
	n31, 182	5:1,1–2	11n44
1:9	77, 79n60, 84,	5:1,1	33n38
	87, 92n29,	5:1,5	49n132, 55n8
	117n14, 121 with	5:1,7–8	55n8
	n24, 126–127,	5:1,7	55n8
	153n9, 180–181	5:1,8	55n8
1:10	75n36, 77	5:1,11	55n8
1:11	127, 181	5:1,12	55n8
2	11 with n45,	5:2	11n45, 56
	19n72, 115n5,	5:2,1–8	56
	123n37,	5:2,1	48n132
	127n55–56, 155	5:2,2	56
2:1	153n9	5:2,3–4	56
2:2	75n36, 158n29	5:2,4	48n132, 60n24,
2:3–4	153n9		153n9
2:4–10	121	5:2,5	56

Hermas		5:6,4-8	42n94, 57,
<i>Similitudes</i> (cont.)			59n23
5:2,6	57	5:6,4	40 with n80.82,
5:2,7-8	61n35		41 with n88.91,
5:2,7	48n132, 57		42 with n94, 57,
5:2,8	57		61n34
5:2,9-11	145n32	5:6,5-7	50n134, 58n16,
5:2,9	108, 112, 123, 155,		180
	157n19.23, 159	5:6,5	35n44, 40n83,
	with n31, 182		57n13
5:2,10	123, 127, 153n9,	5:6,6-7	180
	181	5:6,6	40n83, 42
5:2,11	123	5:6,7	41n91, 57n14-15,
5:3,2-4	49n132		59 with n23,
5:3,3	48n132		61n34, 63n43,
5:3,5-6	123		65n50, 66n56,
5:3,6	77, 84, 180		95n43
5:3,7	29, 115n6, 123,	5:7	57
	124 with n42,	5:7,1-2	57
	127 with n56,	5:7,1	57
	147n37,	5:7,2	20n77, 53-54n5,
	155-157, 159		57 with n15-16,
	with n31,		58, 63n43
	181-182	5:7,3	57, 72n17,
5:3,8-9	127, 181		94n35, 97, 181
5:3,8	124	5:7,4	57, 72n17, 94n36
5:3,9	1n3, 70n5, 72n19,	6:1,1-4	48n132
	73n22, 124	6:1,4	138n37, 139n42
5:4,4	61n29	6:2,1	75n36
5:5-6	43	6:2,2	49n132
5:5	57	6:2,4	66n55, 138
5:5,2	34 with n41, 40	6:2,5-6:3,6	91n27
	with n83, 41	6:3,4	76n44, 91n27
	with n84.90, 42,	6:3,6	75n36, 91n27,
	57 with n15		137n35
5:5,3	49n132, 57,	6:5,4	91n27
	60n24, 75n36	6:5,6-7	75n36
5:5,5-5:6,4	41	6:5,6	91n27
5:5,5-6	57	7	91n27
5:5,5	41-42, 68n72	7:1-7	91n27
5:5,6	57	7:1-3	91n27
5:5,7	57	7:1	61n29, 91n27
5:6-7	56, 57n15, 68	7:2	72n17
5:6,1	40n82, 41n92,	7:3	61n29, 72n20,
	42, 51, 59n23		91n27, 107n49,
5:6,2	42, 51, 59n24,		112, 181
	60n24-25	7:4	91n27, 115n6,
5:6,3	35, 40 with n80,		116n11, 134,
	41n85, 47,		135n28,
	48n132, 60n26		137n35

7:5-7	49n132	8:7,4	145n28
7:5-6	91n27	8:7,5-6	49n132
7:5	91n27	8:7,5	48-49n132, 67,
7:6-7	48-49n132		130n12
7:6	49n132, 70n5,	8:7,6	49n132, 115n6
	73n22, 91n27,	8:8,1-2	79n60
	115n6, 153n9	8:8,1	75n36, 78n51,
7:7	1n3, 73n22,		137n35, 142n6
	91n27	8:8,2	48n132
8-10	13n47	8:8,3	80n71, 81n73,
8	11n45, 13n47,		137n35
	50n134, 130n12	8:8,4	91n27, 137n35
8:1,1	40n82	8:8,5	137n35, 139n42
8:1,2	61n29	8:9,1	78n51, 79, 84,
8:1,18-8:2,4	91n27		137n35, 142n6,
8:1,18	153n9		180
8:2,1-2	153n9	8:9,3	79, 84, 91n27,
8:2,5	80n69, 81n73		180
8:2,7-8	130n12	8:9,4	137n35
8:2,7	139n41	8:10,1	137n35
8:3	48n132	8:10,2	137n35
8:3,2	35, 41n85,	8:10,3	75n36, 139n42
	48-49n132, 51,	8:10,4	91n27
	74, 84, 93n31,	8:11,1-5	41n87
	131n16, 180	8:11,1	38, 137n36
8:3,3	48n130, 61n31	8:11,3-4	48n132
8:3,6-7	91n27	8:11,3	72n17, 137n36,
8:3,7	35 with n49,		138n39, 147n36
	91n27, 153n9	9-10	12n46
8:3,8	49n132, 130n12	9	10n38, 11n46,
8:4,1-2	153n9		13n47, 19n72,
8:4,6	153n9		44n107, 84, 111,
8:5,6	153n9		133, 140, 180
8:6,1	139n41	9:1	14
8:6,3-4	40n79	9:1,1-3	105n41
8:6,3	65n52, 86n8,	9:1,1	14n49, 35n44,
	130, 139n41		48n132
8:6,4	40n82, 80n71,	9:1,3	61n29
	91n27	9:1,4	11
8:6,5	20 with n77,	9:1,8	130n12
	21n82, 53-54n5,	9:1,9	130n12
	75n36	9:1,10	153n9
8:6,6	48n132,	9:2,1	36n50, 41n86
	66-67n65,	9:2,2	36n50, 37n56
	81n73, 138,	9:2,4	10n38
	139n42	9:2,5	106n42
8:7,1	21n81	9:3,1	36 with n52,
8:7,2	146n34		41n86, 111n74,
8:7,3	67, 81n73		113, 172n7

Hermas		9:11	101n16, 141, 147, 150–151, 162 with m10, 163n12.14, 165n25, 166, 170, 175–176, 178 with n35, 182
<i>Similitudes</i> (cont.)			
9:3,2	104n35		104n35
9:3,4–5	111n75, 113	9:11,1–8	106n45, 174
9:3,4	105n40	9:11,1	106
9:4,1	111n75, 113	9:11,2–3	105n39, 106n44–45, 174
9:4,2–3	44n109, 52	9:11,2	71n7, 99n5, 100n15, 101n16, 106n43.45, 162 with m10, 165n23, 174–175, 177
9:4,3	111n75, 113		162 with m10, 170, 182
9:4,4	111n74, 113	9:11,4–6	23, 161, 162n10, 170, 175, 182
9:4,5	111n75, 113	9:11,4–5	23, 161–162, 171, 174 with n14, 176, 177n31, 179, 182
9:4,6–8	37, 41n87	9:11,4	139n41
9:4,8	111n75, 113		161n9, 162, 165n21.25, 167n31, 169n42–44, 177–178
9:5,1	37n58, 111n77, 113	9:11,5–9	175
9:5,2	38n65, 40n82, 41n88, 51, 171n3	9:11,5	106n44, 162 162n10, 163 with n13, 164, 165n22.25, 170, 178, 182
9:5,6	38n65, 41n88, 51, 171n3		147–148, 151, 163 with n13, 164, 170, 175, 178, 182
9:5,7	104n35	9:11,6–7	168n41
9:6	38n65, 41n88, 51, 171n3	9:11,6	132
9:6,1–2	172n5	9:11,7	41n86
9:6,1	61n34, 172		37n56
9:6,2	171, 173, 174 with n14, 177n31		1n1, 36n50, 37n55, 132 with n20, 182
9:6,3–5	80n68		36n51
9:6,4–5	82n77, 84, 180	9:11,8	37, 41n87, 51
9:6,5	81n72		
9:7,1–2	80n71		
9:7,1	40n82, 41n88, 51, 61n34, 171n3		
9:7,3	111n77, 113		
9:7,4–6	80n71		
9:7,5	81n73		
9:8,2–7	111n78, 113		
9:8,2	111 with 76, 113		
9:9,3	111n78, 113		
9:9,5	111n76, 113, 165n25		
9:9,6–7	82n78, 84, 180		
9:9,6	162n10		
9:9,7	67n66, 80n67, 82n78		
9:10,1	162n10		
9:10,3	130n12		
9:10,4–9:11,8	174		
9:10,4	40n82, 82n78, 84, 180		
9:10,6–9:11,8	101n16		
9:10,6–7	174		
9:10,6	106n45		

9:12,3-5	94n41, 97	9:16,2	66n52, 129, 131, 181
9:12,3	37 with n57.60		
9:12,4-5	41n88, 51, 132	9:16,3-4	49n133
9:12,4	37 with n61, 132 with n18	9:16,3	11n40, 66n52, 131, 132 with n18
9:12,5	37 with n62, 40	9:16,4-5	66n52
9:12,6-8	61n34	9:16,4	11n40, 129, 131-132, 181
9:12,6	37 with n63, 132		
9:12,8	38 with n65, 41n88, 51, 62, 94n41, 97, 132n18, 171n3	9:16,5	7n30-31, 131
		9:16,6-7	131
9:12,13	40n83	9:16,6	129, 181
9:13	132	9:16,7	65n52, 131
9:13,1	36n52, 132-133, 162, 170, 182	9:17-18	75n41
		9:17	74n34, 131
9:13,2-5	133	9:17,1-4	44n110, 74, 84, 93n31, 133, 180
9:13,2-3	132n18	9:17,1-2	33, 44, 50n134, 52, 180
9:13,2	37n55, 40n81, 94n41, 97, 133	9:17,1	7n31, 74, 131
		9:17,2	74n34, 131
9:13,3-6	133	9:17,3	131, 132n17
9:13,3	40, 41n88, 133	9:17,4	74 with n34, 131
9:13,5	67n66, 130n12, 132n17, 133	9:17,5	81n72, 132 with n17, 140
9:13,7	75n36, 132n17-18, 133	9:18,2-4	82n78, 84, 180
9:13,9	1n3, 80n70, 81n72, 84, 133, 180	9:18,2	1, 65n52, 66 with n58, 75 with n40
		9:18,3	67n66, 80n67
9:14,1-2	138	9:18,4	67n67, 68n69
9:14,1	1n3	9:18,5	74n34
9:14,2	81n72, 84, 180	9:19,1	75n36, 91n27
9:14,3	40n82, 139	9:19,2-3	20n77, 53-54n5
9:14,4-6	51	9:19,2	20n80, 21 with n83, 85, 153n9
9:14,4	1n1, 36		
9:14,5-6	36, 41n86	9:19,3	21 with n83, 75n36, 79n60, 91n27
9:14,5	43n101, 94n38		
9:14,6	36n53, 49n132	9:20,1-2	79n60
9:15	133	9:20,1	124
9:15,1-2	138, 167	9:20,2-3	94n41, 97
9:15,2-3	19, 94n41, 97	9:20,2	75n36, 124, 142n6
9:15,2	37n55, 55n8		
9:15,3	138	9:20,3	124, 127, 181
9:15,4	7n30-31, 8n35, 43, 44n108.110, 52, 80n65	9:20,4	66n55, 124, 127, 139
9:15,6	78n52	9:21	96
9:16	65n52, 131	9:21,1-3	96 with n46
9:16,1-2	131	9:21,1	96
9:16,1	65n52	9:21,2	137n35
9:16,2-4	94n41, 97	9:21,3	91n27, 96-97

Hermas		9:27,3	61, 125, 127,
<i>Similitudes</i> (cont.)			153n9
9:22	20n80, 21,	9:28,1-7	9n27
	136n33	9:28,1	153n9
9:22,1-2	136n33	9:28,2	40n82
9:22,1	20n77, 21 with	9:28,3-4	153n9
	n85, 53-54n5	9:28,3	39, 40n81
9:22,2	21	9:28,4	40n79
9:22,3	21, 136n33	9:28,5	72n17
9:22,4	9n36	9:28,6	39, 40n81-82,
9:23,2	48n132		90n24
9:23,4	40, 94n35, 97,	9:28,7	40n81
	181	9:29,2	49n132, 94n41,
9:23,5	72n17		97
9:24	157n19	9:30,2	40n82
9:24,1-3	114, 159, 182	9:30,3	45, 50n134
9:24,1	124, 157n19	9:30,5	116n7, 120n22,
9:24,2-3	156-157n19		125 with n51,
9:24,2	60n25, 75n36,		127, 181
	124, 156n19,	9:31,1	132
	158n30	9:31,2	94n41, 97, 116n7,
9:24,3-4	127		125 with n50,
9:24,3	124-125, 156n19		127, 132, 181
9:24,4	61 with n35, 62,	9:31,3-4	132
	125	9:31,3	138
9:25,1-2	130n12	9:32,1	138
9:25,2	7n31, 61 with	9:33	14n49
	n35, 62	9:33,1	1n4, 75n36
9:26	108n61, 130n12	9:33,3	48n132, 137n35
9:26,2	7n31, 23, 127n56,	10	11n46, 13n47
	139n42, 152,	10:1	14n49
	153n9, 154n11,	10:1,2-3	48n132
	159, 182	10:2,2	136n33,
9:26,3-8	9n27		169n45
9:26,3-4	40n79	10:2,3	136n33
9:26,3	75n36, 78n51,	10:2,4	48n132
	142n6	10:3,1	48n132
9:26,4	11n45, 19n72,	10:3,2	72n17, 169n45
	78n52	10:3,4	48n132, 72n17
9:26,6	40n79, 66n55	10:4	125
9:26,8	66n55	10:4,1-3	126n53
9:27	108n61	10:4,1	48n132, 126
9:27,1-2	158n30	10:4,2-4	127, 181
9:27,1	125	10:4,2	125-126, 158n30,
9:27,2	7n29,31, 75n36,		159n31
	110, 114n4, 125,	10:4,3	125-126,
	127n56, 147n37,		159n31
	152n4, 153n9,	10:4,4-5	126n53
	155, 157n21,23,	10:4,4	126-127, 133,
	158n27, 159 with		136n32,
	n31, 182		157n23

Hippolytus	55	Melito of Sardis	
<i>Refutation of All Heresies</i>		<i>Paschal Homily</i>	
8:9	55n9	80	161n6
(Pseudo-)Hippolytus	150, 177	<i>Odes of Solomon</i>	24n1
<i>The Apostolic Tradition</i>		Origen	3, 4 with n13–14, 5, 11, 16, 178n37
18	177n29	<i>Commentary on Romans</i>	
22	150n52	10:31	4n13
26	150n52–53	Polycarp	
Ignatius	7n28	<i>Philippians</i>	85n1
<i>Polycarp</i>		<i>Protevangelium of James</i>	24n1
4:2	156n18	<i>Sayings Source Q</i>	94n39
<i>Romans</i>		<i>Sibylline Oracles</i>	
2:2	160n5	8:310–311	66n52
<i>Smyrnaeans</i>		Tertullian	6, 16, 149, 176, 179
6:2	158n26	<i>Apology</i>	
7:1	148n40	39:5–6	153n9, 158n26
8:2	148n40	39:15	149n47
Irenaeus	6	39:16	149n47.49
<i>Against Heresies</i>		39:17–18	149n47
1:25,6	20n77	39:17	149n48
1:27,2–3	20n77	39:18	149n48, 160n5
2:27,2	31n27	39:19	149n47
4:20,8	62n38	<i>To His Wife</i>	
Jerome	4n13	2:4,3	176n26
<i>On Illustrious Men</i>		<i>Trullan Synod, Canon 74</i>	150n55
10	4n13	6 Greek and Roman Literature	
Justin Martyr	30, 89, 149, 150n51, 157, 171, 178 with n37, 179, 182	Aeschines	
<i>1 Apology</i>		<i>Against Timarchus</i>	
13:1–2	160n5	188	175n20
17:3–4	89n21	Aristophanes	
65:2	178n37	<i>Frogs</i>	
66:3	30n27	345	169n44
67:3	30–31n27, 149n43	<i>Peace</i>	
67:5	149n43.45	860–862	169n44
67:6–7	153n9, 158n26		
67:6	149n44, 153n8, 158n24		
67:7	149n46		

Diodorus Siculus		Ovid	65
20:53,3	135n30	<i>Metamorphoses</i>	65n50
20:77,3	135n30	14:805–852	95n43
Epictetus	99	Petronius	160n5
<i>Discourses</i>		<i>Satyricon</i>	
2:18,15	100n9	109	161n5
		133	168n38
Euripides		<i>The Banquet of</i>	
<i>Bacchanals</i>		<i>Trimalchio</i>	167
188–190	169n44	70:10	167n37
<i>Electra</i>		Phaedrus	
44	175n20	5:1,5	173n9
Herodotus		Pliny the Younger	148, 149 with
<i>Histories</i>			n42
3:30	173n8	<i>Letters</i>	
3:68	175n18	5:26	110n68
5:56	172n7	7:27,2	172n7
7:12	172n7	10:96–97	8n32
<i>Homeric Hymns</i>		10:96	148n42
2:187–190	172n7	10:96,7	150n51
		19:96,8	160n5
Isocrates		<i>Panegyricus</i>	
<i>Panegyricus</i>		24:2	173n9
4:114	175n20	Plutarch	
Livy		<i>Convivial Questions</i>	
<i>The History of Rome</i>		1:615A–C	161n5
1:16,1	95n43	1:622A	161n5
1:16,3	95n43	1:622C	161n5
Longus	167	2:643B	161n5
<i>Daphnis and Chloe</i>		3:645A	161n5
2:23,1	173n7	7:711D	161n5
2:31,1–3	161n5	7:712F	161n5
2:31,2–3	167n36	7:713B	161n5
4:38,3	161n5, 167n36	9:736E–F	161n5
		9:743C	161n5
Lucian of Samosata		Seneca	93
<i>Zeus Rants</i>		<i>Apocolocyntosis</i>	95n43
2	175n19	5:1	96n43
Martial		8:1–3	96n43
<i>Epigrams</i>		8:3	93n34
2:59	172n4	<i>On Benefits</i>	
Musonius		1:3,2–5	167n32
18A	146n35	1:3,2	167n32

- | | | | |
|---|--------|--|--|
| 2:12 | 173n9 | | |
| 2:12,2 | 173n13 | | |
| <i>On Clemency</i> | | | |
| 1:1,2 | 95n42 | | |
| <i>On Consolation to Marcia</i> | | | |
| 1:2 | 110n68 | | |
| <i>Moral Epistles</i> | | | |
| 14:3 | 146n35 | | |
| 14:15 | 147n35 | | |
| Suetonius | | | |
| <i>Caligula</i> | | | |
| 56:2 | 173n9 | | |
| <i>Nero</i> | | | |
| 13:2 | 173n13 | | |
| <i>Otho</i> | | | |
| 6:2 | 173n9 | | |
| Tacitus | | | |
| <i>Annales</i> | | | |
| 11:21 | 173n7 | | |
| 15:71 | 173n9 | | |
| <i>Histories</i> | | | |
| 1:45 | 173n9 | | |
| 4:83 | 173n7 | | |
| Velleius Paterculus | | | |
| <i>Compendium of Roman History</i> | | | |
| 2:124,3 | 95n43 | | |
| Xenophon | | | |
| <i>The Education of Cyrus</i> | | | |
| 8:7,2 | 172n7 | | |
| <i>Symposium</i> | | | |
| 9:2 | 176n21 | | |
| 7 Inscriptions, Papyri and Other Manuscripts | | | |
| <i>Archilochos Inscription</i> | | | |
| | 170n48 | | |
| <i>CIL</i> 6 | 100n13 | | |
| <i>CIL</i> 9:2628 | 95n43 | | |
| | | <i>Codex Athous (A)</i> | 15, 16n64, 28n20, 29n21, 34n41, 36n51, 39 with n74–77, 40n80, 41n92, 64n48, 73n24, 75n36, 78n51–52, 98n3, 117n15, 120n21, 121n24–25, 123n38, 124n44.46, 132n19–20, 138n39, 143 with n16, 161n7 |
| | | <i>Codex Guelferbytanus</i> 51 (Ath ¹) | 120n21 |
| | | <i>Codex Parisinus Graecus</i> 635 (Ath ²) | 120n21, 123n38 |
| | | <i>Codex Sinaiticus (S)</i> | 15, 16n64, 28n20, 39 with n77, 64n48, 78n51, 98n3, 99n3, 117n15, 143 with n16 |
| | | <i>Coptic-Akhmimic Version of Hermas (C^a)</i> | 14, 36n51, 132n20 |
| | | <i>Coptic-Sahidic Version of Hermas (C^s)</i> | 14, 36n51, 120n21, 132n20, 138n39 |
| | | <i>Ethiopic Version of Hermas (E)</i> | 15, 28n20, 34n41, 36n51, 39 with n74.76–77, 40n80, 41n92, 64n48, 73n24, 78n51, 98n3, 120n21, 121n24–25, 124n44.46, 126n52, 132n19–20, 138n39, 143n16, 161n7 |

<i>Florilegium of Patristic Texts,</i> <i>Codex Paris gr. 1143 (F)</i>	123n38	<i>Papyrus Iandanae</i> 1:4	3n8
<i>Inscription from Cyrene</i> (<i>SPAW.PH</i> 1927, p. 157)	175n18	<i>Papyrus Michigan 129 (M)</i>	14, 16 with n64, 29n21, 34n41, 40n80, 41n92, 73n24, 123n38, 138n39
<i>Itt 13/2 s.v.</i> 17 September AD 14	95n43		
<i>Palatine (L²)</i>	15, 28n20, 29n21, 34n41, 36n51, 39 with n74–77, 40n80, 41n92, 64n48, 73n24, 78n51, 98–99n3, 117n15, 119–120n21, 121n24–25, 124n44.46, 126n52, 132n19–20, 138n39, 143 with n16, 161n7	<i>Papyrus Michigan 130 (M²)</i> <i>Papyrus Prague 1 (P)</i> <i>Vulgate (L¹)</i>	117n15, 118n18 120n21 3n8, 15, 28n20, 29n21, 34n41, 36n51, 39 with n74–77, 40n80, 41n92, 64n48, 73n24, 75n36, 78n51–52, 94n36, 98n3, 117n15, 119–120n21, 121n24–25, 124n44.46, 126n52, 132n19–20, 138n39, 143 with n16, 161n7
<i>Papyrus Bodmer 38 (Bo)</i>	14, 16n64, 28n20, 39 with n77, 64n48, 78n51, 98–99n3, 143 with n16		

Index of Modern Authors

- Achelis, H. 101n16
 Adams, C.D. 175n20
 Adnès, P. 134n26
 Ahearne-Kroll, S.P. 102n22, 111n79
 Aland, B. 82n75, 88n15, 117n16, 130n13,
 135n28, 142n7, 143n12–13, 156n19, 157n20
 Aland, K. 18n68, 82n75, 108n61, 117n16,
 130n13, 135n28, 142n7, 143n12–13, 156n19,
 157n20
 Aldrete, G.S. 171n1
 Alès, A. d' 81n74
 Alföldi, A. 173n9
 Alikin, V.A. 29n23, 30n26, 31n30, 148n38,
 149n50, 150n55, 152n3.5.7, 153n8–9,
 154n10, 155n17, 156n19, 158n27,
 160–161n5, 167n35, 171n1–2, 173n10,
 177n28, 178n36
 Altaner, B. 16n65
 Ambra, E. D' 71n16, 102n20
 Amstutz, J. 55n8
 Andresen, C. 167n33
 Angelo, M.R. D' 18n70, 100n9, 102n22,
 103n27, 107n48, 110n69
 Arbesmann, R. 115n6
 Arms, J. D' 77n50
 Audet, J.-P. 26 with n10, 27n14, 38n66, 40n81,
 41n92, 53n3, 118n18
 Aune, D.E. 30n24, 33n36, 46n121, 54n5
 Auwers, J.-M. 6n24, 56n11
 Avemarie, F. 58n16
 Avery-Peck, A.J. 62n36
 Ayres, L. 29n22
 Bagatti, B. 24n1, 35n46
 Bainbridge, W.S. 69n2, 70 with n3, 84
 Bakel, H.A. van 12n47
 Balch, D.L. 17n65, 71n8, 73n25, 101n16,
 102n19, 105n37–38, 107n48, 109n62,
 110n65
 Bardy, G. 3n10, 4n13, 31n29, 158n28, 165n26
 Barnard, L.W. 2n6, 12n47, 14n51, 105n41
 Bartelink, G.J.M. 150n51
 Barton, J. 160n5
 Basore, J.W. 167n32, 173n9.13
 Bauckham, R.J. 92n27
 Bauer, W. 31n28, 60n27, 82n75, 117n16,
 130n13, 135n28, 142n7, 143 with n12–13,
 156n19, 157n20
 Baumbach, M. 92n27
 Baumgärtner, P. 11n46
 Baus, K. 92n27
 Becker, C. 149n47, 153n9, 158n26, 160n5
 Benko, S. 171n2, 173n10, 175n16, 177n28
 Berger, T. 166n27
 Berthelot, K. 127n54
 Betzig, L. 102n18
 Blomkvist, V. 12n46, 128n2.4, 129n6.8, 130n13,
 132n18, 134n23
 Bolt, P.G. 96n44
 Bonner, C. 14n55
 Botte, B. 150n52–53, 177n29
 Bousset, W. 38n68
 Bowe, B.E. 166n30
 Bradshaw, P.F. 150n55
 Brandenburg, H. 45n115
 Brandon, S.G.F. 60n28
 Braun, H. 58n16
 Braund, S. 95n42
 Bremmer, J. 171n1
 Brennecke, H.C. 88n15
 Brent, A. 85n1
 Brien, D.O' 114n1
 Briggs, C. 164n15
 Brilliant, R. 173n9
 Brown, F. 164n15
 Brown, P. 102n17, 103n29
 Brox, N. 2n6, 4n12.16, 9n37–38, 12n46,
 14n51–53, 16n64, 17n65–66, 18n68,
 19n71, 20n78–80, 21n82.85–86, 24n1, 25
 with n6, 27n16, 28n18–20, 29n21, 31n27,
 32n34, 33n37, 34n40–41, 35n43–45.48,
 38n68, 40n81–83, 43, 44n107.109,
 45n111.115, 46n120, 47, 48n130.132,
 49n132, 50n134, 53–54n5, 55n7, 56n10,
 57n15, 58n16, 59n23, 61n30, 62n38,
 63n43, 67n64, 68n72, 71n7.9.11.13–14,
 72n18–19, 73n22, 74n31–32.34, 75n37.41,
 76n43–44, 78n54, 79n57.60, 81n72.74,

- Brox, N. (cont.)
 82n75–76.78–79, 86n6, 87n9–10.13,
 89n19, 90n24.26, 91–92n27, 93n33,
 94n38, 98n3, 99n5.8, 101n16, 102n21–22,
 105n41, 106n42–45, 107n50, 109n61,
 110n73, 111n76.79, 112n81, 114 with n2–4,
 115n5–6, 116n8–9, 117n12.14.16, 119n18.21,
 121n23–24.26–27, 122n29–30.32–34,
 123n36, 124n41.43.45, 125n47–48,
 126n53, 127n55, 128n2, 130n13, 134n25,
 135n28, 136n31–32, 138n40, 141n1, 142
 with n9.11, 143 with n15, 152n4–5,
 155n15–17, 156n18–19, 157n22, 158n25.29,
 161n8–9, 162n10, 168n40, 172n5, 177n30,
 178n35
- Bruin, T. de 66n53
- Bucur, B.G. 35n43, 42n100, 53n4, 61n35
- Burchard, C. 172n4, 175n17, 177n33
- Campenhausen, H. von 109n61
- Carleton Paget, J. 24n1, 26n9
- Carlini, A. 3n8, 14n55, 39n77, 78n51, 117n15,
 139n42
- Carter, W. 94n39, 95n42
- Casey, P.M. 50n134
- Cavallo, G. 78n51
- Cecconi, P. 3n8, 64n48
- Chalcraft, D.J. 69n2, 70n2.4, 79n61
- Champagny, F. de 12n47
- Christ, W. von 2n6, 4n15
- Cirillo, L. 9n36, 12n47
- Clark, E.A. 101n16
- Clark, K.W. 17n65
- Clarke, G. 150n54
- Clerc, J. le 54n7
- Cleveland Cox, A. 6n26, 8n32
- Coleborne, W. 13n47
- Collins, A.Y. 13n48, 17n66, 59n22, 64n45,
 90n22
- Collins, J.J. 62n36
- Collins, J.N. 117n14
- Corley, J. 104n34
- Cotelier, J.-B. 54n7
- Cox, C.E. 30n26
- Crombie, F. 8n32, 20n80
- Daniel, S. 16n5
- Daniélou, J. 24n1, 26 with n11, 27n14
- Dassmann, E. 18n68
- Daumas, F. 16n5, 164n16–17.19, 165n21–23.25
- Davies, W.D. 24n1
- De Mey, P. 69n1, 98n1
- Deemter, R. van 16n65, 64n48
- Degrassi, A. 95n43
- Delobel, J. 1n2
- Dewey, A.J. 166n30
- Dibelius, M. 4n15, 8n32, 9n36.38, 11n46,
 16n64–65, 18n69, 20n78–80,
 21n82.84.86, 22n87, 24n1, 25 with n5,
 28n20, 34n41, 35n42–44, 38n68, 39 with
 n78, 45 with n11.115, 46n118, 48n132,
 53–54n5, 55n7, 59n23–24, 60n29,
 64n47, 71n7.11.14, 72n19–21, 73n22,
 74n30–34, 75n37, 76n43–44, 78n53,
 79n57–59, 80n66, 81n72.74–75,
 82n76.78, 86n6, 87n9.13–14, 90n24,
 92n27, 93n33, 96n45, 98n3, 99n5.8,
 100n9, 101n16, 102n22, 106n42, 111n76,
 114 with n3.5, 115n6, 116n8.11, 117n12.16,
 118n18, 119n20–21, 121n27, 123n36.39,
 124n40–41, 125n48, 126n53, 129n8,
 130n13, 135n28, 136n32, 142 with n8.11,
 143 with n15, 146n35, 157n22, 158n25,
 161n9, 162n10, 163n13, 168n39, 171n4,
 177n30, 178n35
- Diercks, G.F. 150n54
- Dihle, A. 118n16
- Dix, G. 29n22
- Dixon, S. 102n19–20
- Dölger, F.J. 130n13, 167n34
- Donaldson, J. 6n26, 8n32
- Donfried, K.P. 2n6, 94n39, 100n9, 145n28
- Drexhage, H.-J. 156n18
- Driver, S. 164n15
- Duchesne, L. 54n5
- Dunn, J.D.G. 47n127, 50n134
- Dupont-Sommer, A. 27n14
- Eckert, J. 93n32
- Ehrman, B.D. 5n20, 9n37, 16n64, 19n71,
 28n20, 29n21, 31n29, 34n41, 36n51,
 39n72.74–77, 40n80, 41n92, 64n48,
 78n51, 98n3, 106n41, 112n81, 117n13,
 118n18, 120n21, 121n24–25, 123n38,
 124n44.46, 126n52, 132n19–20, 138n39,
 143n14.16, 148n40–41, 156n18,
 158n26–27, 160n5, 161n7
- Eijk, T.H.C. van 57n16, 58n20

- Enslin, M.S. 16n65
 Ernst, U. 100n15, 104n33, 105n37, 109n61,
 136n34
 Ferguson, E. 30n26
 Foerster, G. 29n22
 Ford, J.M. 27n14, 50n134
 Foster, B.O. 95n43
 Foster, P. 47n126, 172n6
 Frank, K.S. 18n68
 Frede, H.J. 4n13
 Frei, H.A. 135n29, 138n38.40
 Frenschkowski, M. 92n27, 94n39
 Frijhoff, W. 17n11
 Frohnes, H. 167n33
 Fuhrmann, S. 91n26
 Funk, F.X. 11n46, 16n64, 29n21, 101n16,
 144n21, 152n6, 158n26, 176n27
 Gamble, H.Y. 29n22, 30n25
 Garleff, G. 26n9, 46n123, 50n134, 51
 Garrett, S.R. 92n27
 Garrison, R. 114n1
 Gebhardt, O. von 7n28, 8n32.35, 11n46,
 16n64, 29n21, 40n80, 48n130, 142n11,
 156n18
 Geer, R.M. 135n30
 Giet, S. 12n46, 13n47, 57n16, 61n29.33, 63n43,
 129n5
 Godley, A.D. 172n7, 173n8, 175n18
 Goldhahn-Müller, I. 133n21, 134n23
 Goold, G.P. 65n50, 95n43
 Goppelt, L. 46n122
 Gössmann, E. 166n30
 Grabbe, L.L. 70n4
 Gregory, A.F. 2n7, 9n37, 103n28
 Grillmeier, A. 34n42, 35n43–44, 36n53
 Gross, K. 167n34, 169n43
 Grotz, J. 81n74, 135n27
 Grundeken, M. 29n23, 53n1, 69n1, 73n24,
 85n1, 98n1, 128n1
 Grundmann, R. 91n26
 Gültzow, H. 156n18
 Gummere, R.M. 146–147n35
 Guttenberger, G. 94n39
 Haase, W. 101n16
 Hagan, A.P. O' 92n27
 Hagemann, H. 152n5
 Hahneman, G.M. 3n9, 4n13.15, 5n19,
 6n24, 7n28.30, 8n32–33.35–36, 55n9,
 86n6
 Haines-Eitzen, K. 31n31
 Hallett, J.P. 100n9, 102n18, 107n147, 110n68,
 111n79
 Hammond Bammel, C.P. 4n13
 Hands, A.R. 117n16
 Hanson, A.T. 27n14
 Harnack, A. von 7n28, 8n32.35, 11n46,
 16n64, 29n21, 31n28, 40n80, 48n130,
 109n62, 142n11, 156n18–19
 Harris, J.R. 3n8
 Hasler, V.E. 48 with n131
 Hausleiter, J. 12n47
 Hefele, C.J. 101n16
 Hellholm, C. 12n46, 130n13
 Hellholm, D. 12n46, 14n54, 28n20, 90n22,
 130n13
 Helmbold, W.C. 161n5
 Henderson, J. 161n5, 167n36, 173n7
 Henne, P. 7n27, 12n46, 15n59.61–62, 16n63,
 59n23, 67n64, 78n55, 128n3
 Hennecke, E. 101n16
 Hense, O. 146n35
 Henten, J.W. van 148n38
 Herding, W. 4n13
 Hetteema, T.L. 96n48
 Hilgenfeld, A. 13n47, 108n61, 124n44
 Hilhorst, A. 8n32, 9n36, 11n44, 12n46, 14n52,
 19n72–73, 28 with n18–19, 46n120,
 92n27
 Hill, C.E. 58 with n17, 62 with n37, 63n44,
 68 with n71
 Hoade, E. 24n1
 Hoffleit, H.B. 161n5
 Holloway, P.A. 102n22, 111n79
 Holmes, M.W. 13n47, 24n1
 Hömke, N. 92n27
 Horbury, W. 24n1
 Hörmann, K. 38n68
 Horsley, R.A. 94n39
 Horst, P.W. van der 118n16
 Horstmanshoff, H.F.J. 90n22
 Hort, F.J.A. 3n8
 Horton, C. 29n22
 Houtepen, A. 148n38
 Hübner, R.M. 109n61
 Huß, B. 176n21

- Hvalvik, R. 24n1, 25 with n8, 26n9, 27n14, 36n53, 43 with n104, 47n128, 50n134, 60n29
- Imhof, P. 109n61
- Immoos, T. 166n30
- Jackson-McCabe, M.A. 24n1, 26n9
- Jackson, J. 173n7.9
- Janeras, S. 139n42
- Jeffers, J.S. 2n6, 19n72, 100n9
- Jensen, A. 101n16
- Johnson, B. 69n2
- Jokiranta, J. 69n2
- Joly, R. 12n46, 16n64, 17n65, 20n80, 27n14, 28n20, 31n31, 41n92, 53–54n5, 57n16, 62n36, 86n4.6, 87n11, 98n3, 101n16, 114 with n4, 120n21, 132n20, 133n22, 135n28, 136n32, 138n39, 143n15, 161n9
- Jonge, H.J. de 1n2, 6n24, 30n26, 56 with n11, 90n22, 96n48, 148n38, 160–161n5, 164n17, 166n28–29, 167n35
- Jungmann, J.A. 29n22
- Junod, E. 167n31, 172n4.6
- Kabiersch, J. 117n16
- Kaestli, J.-D. 167n31, 172n4.6
- Kamlah, E. 32n36
- Kampen, N.B. 71n16
- Kelthoffer, J.A. 102n22, 111n79
- Kelly, J.N.D. 29n22, 30n26
- Klahr, D. 118n16, 132n16, 135n28
- Klassen, W. 171n1, 172n4, 175n16, 176n24
- Klevinghaus, J. 45 with n113, 46n122, 48n130, 50n134
- Klijn, A.F.J. 24n1
- Klinghardt, M. 77n50, 160n2.4, 161n6, 162n11, 163n12.14, 164n17–18, 165n20.24–26, 166n26, 167n32.34, 168n41, 169n44, 170n48
- Knieps, T. 69n1, 98n1
- Knorr, U.W. 167n33
- Koester, H. 2n7, 7n28, 32 with n34, 60n29, 118n18
- Koet, B.J. 30n26
- Kooij, A. van der 96n48
- Körtner, U.H.J. 1n4
- Kötting, B. 18n68
- Kovacs, D. 175n20
- Kraeling, C.H. 160n5
- Kraemer, R.S. 18n70, 100n9, 102n22, 107n48, 110n69
- Kraus, T.J. 66n52, 172n6
- Kretschmar, G. 59n23
- Kümmel, W.G. 93n30
- Labahn, M. 85n1, 89n17, 90n23, 94n39
- Labriolle, P. de 101n16
- Lake, K. 48n130, 58 with n20, 59n23, 60n29, 61n33.35, 62n36
- Lampe, P. 5n18, 17n65, 92n27, 109n62, 136n31
- Lane, W.L. 145n28
- Lane Fox, R. 16n65, 100n11
- Lebreton, J. 35n42–43, 68n72
- Lehtipuu, O. 85n1, 111n79
- Leipoldt, J. 109n62, 111n79
- Leon, H. 25n2
- Leutzsch, M. 1n4–5, 2n7, 3n8, 4n14.17, 5n18, 7n28, 8n35, 9n38, 14n50, 15n56.59, 16 with n64, 17n65, 19n72.76, 28n20, 29n21, 31n30, 34n41, 36n51, 39n72.74–77, 40n80, 41n92, 42 with n99, 45n15, 46n18, 54n5, 64n48, 71n7, 78n51, 85n2, 87n11, 96n47, 98n3, 100n9.15, 104n31–32, 105n41, 106n45, 108n61, 110n72, 111n80, 112n81, 115n6, 116n8, 117n12.14, 118n16–17, 120n21, 121n24–25.27, 122n27, 123n38, 124n41.44.46, 125n48, 126n52–53, 130n13, 132n19–20, 135n28, 143n14.16, 152n1.5, 155n16–17, 156n18–19, 157n22, 158n25, 161n7, 162n10, 169n44, 172n5, 173n9
- Lichtenberger, H. 58n16
- Lietart Peerbolte, B.J. 90n23
- Lietzmann, H. 108n61, 150n51
- Lightfoot, J.B. 3n12
- Lindemann, A. 18n67, 31n29, 46n121
- Link, A. 11n46
- Lipsius, R.A. 54n7
- Lisco, H. 10n38
- Lluis-Font, P. 26 with n12, 27n14, 43 with n103
- Löhr, H. 134n23
- Lohse, B. 161n6
- Lohse, E. 56n12
- Lona, H.E. 63n43, 65n51
- Longenecker, R.N. 96n44
- Louth, A. 29n22
- Lucchesi, E. 15n55

- Lüdemann, G. 73n24
Lund, A.A. 93n34, 95n43
Luomanen, P. 24n1, 26n9, 50–51n134, 55n9
Luschnat, O. 162n10, 163n13, 169n44, 171n4, 174n14
Lusini, G. 16n64
Luttikhuisen, G.P. 55n9
- MacDonald, M.Y. 18n70, 100n12–13, 102n17, 104n31–32, 107n46, 109n62, 110n69
Mackenzie, F.S. 60n29, 61n33
MacLeod, M.D. 175n19
Madigan, K. 109n63–64, 110n66
Maier, H.O. 4n12, 5n20, 7n28.30, 8n32, 9n37, 13n47, 19n74, 69n1, 73n24, 77n50, 145n28
Malherbe, A.J. 30n26
Mannion, G. 69n1, 98n1
Manns, F. 24n1
Mara, M.G. 61n34
Marchant, E.C. 176n21
Marcovich, M. 160n5, 176n25, 177n28
Marjanen, A. 55n9
Martín, J.P. 32n36
Martin, R.P. 30n26
Mastin, B.A. 88n15
Mauer, J. auf der 166n30
McGowan, A. 150n55
McGuire, M.B. 69n2
Meeks, W.A. 17n65, 29n22, 88n16, 160n5
Meggitt, J. 160n5
Meiser, M. 85n1, 89n17, 94n39
Menken, M.J.J. 1n2, 30n26, 46n121
Metzger, B.M. 3n8
Michaelis, W. 60n28
Miller, F.J. 65n50, 95n43
Miller, P. (Cox) 17n65, 136n34
Miller, W. 172n7
Mimouni, S.C. 24n1, 33n36, 47n125
Minar, E.L. 161n5
Minns, D. 30n27, 89n21, 149n43, 153n8, 158n24.26, 160n5, 178n37
Miquel, P. 161n5, 164n16–17.19, 165n21–23.25
Mitchell, M.M. 29n22
Moeller, B. 131n16
Mommensen, T. 95n43
Moore, C.H. 173n7.9
Mosès, A. 108n55
- Moss, C.R. 8n33
Moxnes, H. 60n29
Moyise, S. 30n26
Moyo, A. 61n29
Muddiman, J. 9n37
Mulder, M.J. 29n22
Mullen, R.L. 132n16
Muller, E. 61n33
Müller, K. 160n5, 168n38
Munier, C. 176n26
Murray, O. 77n50
- Nanos, M.D. 50n134
Nash, R.S. 153n9
Nautin, P. 13n47
Neusner, J. 62n36
Nickelsburg, G.W.E. 66n53
Nicklas, T. 58n16, 66n52, 172n6
Niederwimmer, K. 33n36, 119n18
Nijendijk, L.W. 13n47, 38n68, 40n82
Nodet, E. 172n4
Norderval, Ø. 12n46, 130n13
Norlin, G. 175n20
Norris, F.W. 30n26
- Oakes, P. 2n7
Økland, J. 59n22, 62n36, 64n45, 67n60
Oldfather, W.A. 100n9
Opitz, H. 59n23
Osborn, E. 128n3
Osiek, C. 2n6, 3n11, 4n13–15, 5n21–22, 6n23.25, 7n28–29.31, 8n32, 9n37–38, 11n42.45, 12n46, 13n47, 14n50–51, 15n57–58.60, 16n63–64, 17n65–66, 19n71–75, 20n77–79, 21n81.83–84, 22n88–89, 24n1, 25 with n2–4.7, 27n14.16, 28n17.19–20, 29n21, 32 with n34–35, 33n87, 34 with n39–41, 35 with n43–45.48, 37n54.58–59, 38 with n64.68.70, 39 with n71.73.77.79, 40n81.83, 41n93, 42 with n96–98, 43n105, 44 with n107.110, 45n114–115, 46n118–120, 47 with n129, 49n132, 50n134, 53n4–5, 54n5–6, 55n8, 57 with n16, 58 with n19, 59 with n21.23–24, 61n30.32–33, 62n39–40, 64n48, 65n52, 67n64, 69n1, 71n7–9.11.13–15, 72n18–20, 73n22.24–25.28, 74n30–32.34, 75n37.41,

Osiek, C. (cont.)

76n43-44, 77n45, 48, 78n50-51, 54-56,
79n57, 60, 80n63-64, 71, 81n72, 74,
82n76, 78-79, 86n3, 6, 87n9-10, 12,
90n26, 92n27, 93n33, 96n45, 98n3,
99n5, 8, 100n12-13, 101n16, 102n17, 19, 22,
104n31-32, 105n37-38, 107n46, 48, 50,
109n62-64, 110n65-66, 111n76, 114n3,
115n5-6, 116n7-10, 117n11, 13-14, 118n18,
119n19-21, 120n22, 121n23-24, 27,
122n28, 30-31, 33-34, 123n35-36,
124n41-42, 125n48-49, 126n53,
127n55-57, 128n3, 129n7-8, 130n10-13,
131n14, 132n17-18, 135n28, 136n32,
139n41, 141n4, 142 with n6-7, 10, 143 with
n12, 144n19-20, 23, 27, 145n28, 31, 146n35,
152n2, 5, 153n8, 154n12, 155n15-17,
156n18, 157n19, 21-22, 158n25, 159n31,
162n10, 169n44, 172n5, 174n15,
177n30-31, 178n35

Özen, A. 73n24

Paramelle, J. 134n26

Parkin, T.G. 18n70

Parsons, P. 3n8

Parvis, P. 30n27, 89n21, 149n43, 153n8,
158n24, 26, 160n5, 178n37

Penn, M.P. 171n1-2, 172n4, 173n9-12,
176n22-23, 177n28, 32, 34, 178n34-35, 37

Pernveden, L. 42n98, 61n29, 33, 63n42, 128n4

Perrot, C. 29n22

Perry, B.E. 173n9

Pesch, R. 88n16

Peterson, E. 9n38, 10n38-39, 11n43, 13n47,
17n65, 50n134, 92n27

Phillips, L.E. 178n35

Piana, G. la 53n4

Plooi, D. 55n8, 99n8

Plümacher, E. 89n18

Pomeroy, A.J. 18n70

Poschmann, B. 81n74, 128n3, 134n24-25,
135n27

Pratscher, W. 12n46

Preuschen, E. 142n11, 143

Radice, B. 8n32, 148n42, 160n5, 172n7, 173n9

Rahlf, A. 49n132, 79n57, 96n45, 164n15,
176n21

Rahner, K. 81n74, 135n27

Ratzinger, J. 160n1

Rauch, A. 109n61

Rawson, B. 100n13

Regev, E. 70n2

Reid, B.E. 104n34

Reiling, J. 120n22

Reinink, G.J. 24n1

Reiterer, F.V. 58n16

Richardson, P. 2n6, 100n9, 145n28

Richey, L.B. 88n16, 94n39

Rife, J.M. 4n15, 16n65

Ritter, A.M. 85n1

Roberts, A. 6n26, 8n32

Robinson, D.C. 137n35

Roca-Puig, R. 139n42

Rolfe, J.C. 173n9, 13

Roodenburg, H. 171n1

Rordorf, W. 33n36

Rouwhorst, G.A.M. 29n22, 30n25

Rowland, C. 60n28

Rüpke, J. 19n72, 64n48

Rutgers, L.V. 29n22

Salzmann, J.C. 30n25, 149n42

Sandbach, F.H. 16n15

Sandnes, K.O. 130n13

Sandt, H. van de 1n2, 26n9, 32-33n36, 119n18

Savinell, P. 126n54

Schäfer, W. 101n16

Schäublin, C. 88n15

Schmid, W. 2n6, 4n15

Schmitt, T. 89n17

Schnackenburg, R. 63n42

Schneider, A. 128n3, 133n22, 134n23, 135n28

Schottroff, L. 101n15

Schrage, W. 93n32, 145n33

Schröter, J. 119n18

Schulz, S. 48n131

Schweitzer, V. 35 with n47, 48n130

Schwertner, S.M. 183

Seim, T.K. 59n22, 62n36, 64n45, 67n60

Seitz, O.J.F. 33n36

Senior, D. 17n67

Setzer, C. 58n16

Shackleton Bailey, D.R. 172n4

Sharpe, J.L. 17n65

Shepherd, T. 13n48, 53n1

- Sherwin-White, A.N. 148n42
 Shipley, F.W. 95n43
 Singor, H.W. 90n22
 Sittl, C. 165n25
 Skarsaune, O. 24n1, 26n9, 47n128
 Skeris, R.A. 169n42
 Smith, M.M. 105n41
 Smith, M.S. 167n37
 Snoek, J.A.M. 96n48
 Snyder, G. 16n64, 38n67, 44n110, 48n130,
 54n5, 63n44, 76n43, 92n27, 99n5,
 145n30
 Sommer, W. 118n16, 132n16, 135n28
 Sorge-Møller, V. 64n45-49
 Spitta, F. 12n47
 Staats, R. 7n28, 8n32, 9n36, 12n46, 105n41
 Stahl, A. 118n18
 Stählin, O. 2n6, 4n15
 Stanjek, H. 4n13
 Stark, R. 69n2, 70 with n3, 84
 Straten, F. van 90n22
 Strecker, G. 31n28
 Streeter, B.H. 5n20
 Ström, A. von 16n65
 Strubbe, J.H.M. 90n22
 Stuiber, A. 16n65
 Sturdy, J. 24n1
 Suggs, M.J. 33n36
 Sundberg, A.C. 5n20
 Syreeni, K. 32n36
 Sysling, H. 29n22
- Taylor, C. 11n46, 32n36
 Taylor, J.E. 24n1
 Thiersch, H.W. 12n47
 Thomassen, E. 67n60
 Thompson, J.W. 30n26
 Thorsteinsson, R.M. 114n4
 Thurén, L. 89n17-20
 Torjesen, K.J. 108n54-60, 111n79
 Tornau, C. 3n8, 64n48
 Tuckett, C.M. 9n37, 17n67, 43n102, 47 with
 1124.126-127, 103n28
 Tulloch, J.H. 100n12-13, 102n17, 104n31-32,
 107n46
 Turmel, J. 16n65
- Unnik, W.C. van 135n29, 166n30
- Van Oyen, G. 53n1
 Vegge, T. 12n46, 130n13
 Verheyden, J. 6n24, 7n27, 26n9, 30n26,
 46n123, 47n125, 58n16, 73n24, 103n28,
 128n1
 Versnel, H.S. 90n22
 Verweij, P.G. 45 with n112, 46n122, 48n131
 Völter, D. 12n47
 Volz, P. 63n42
- Wacker, M.-T. 101n15
 Wansink, C.S. 73n24, 142n5, 152n5
 Wassen, C. 69n2
 Weaver, P.R.C. 100n13
 Wehofer, T.M. 99n8
 Weinell, H. 114n3
 Wellez, E. 160n5
 Werner, M.S. 60n28
 West, M.L. 172n7
 White, J.C. 19n71, 169n44
 Whittaker, M. 6n27, 14n51, 16n64, 28n20,
 29n21, 34n41, 36n51, 39n72.74-77,
 40n80, 41n92, 64n48, 78n51, 98n3,
 120n21, 121n24-25, 123n38, 124n44-46,
 126n52, 132n19-20, 138n39, 143n14.16,
 161n7
 Wickert, U. 88n15
 Wikgren, A.P. 17n65, 33n36
 Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von 175n18
 Willoughby, H.R. 17n65
 Wilson, B.R. 69n2, 70 with n2.4, 79n62, 82,
 83 with n80, 84
 Wilson, J.C. 7n28, 12n46, 26, 27n13, 42 with
 n95, 43n101
 Wilson, W.J. 99n5
 Winter, B.W. 108n60
 Wyrwa, D. 88n15
- Young, F.M. 29n22
 Young, N.H. 153n9
 Young, S. 106n42
- Zahn, T. 8n32, 16n64, 19n73, 35n44, 44n109,
 48n132, 63n44, 86n5-6, 87n19.12, 92n27,
 115n6, 118n18, 119n21
 Zangenberger, J.K. 26n9, 85n1, 89n17, 90n23,
 94n39, 119n18
 Zobel, G. 166n30